

Creating a 'Public' in St Petersburg, 1703-1761

Paul Keenan

School of Slavonic and East European Studies, UCL

Ph.D. History

UMI Number: U592953

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI U592953

Published by ProQuest LLC 2013. Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Abstract

The thesis deals with the creation of a 'public' in St Petersburg during the first half of the eighteenth century. The term 'public' has generated a considerable historiography dealing with its implications for the field of eighteenth-century studies, which are discussed in the introduction along with the contemporary definitions of the word. In eighteenth-century Russia, the term 'public' usually carried the meaning of 'audience', typically in reference to the theatre and other spectacles. The definition of this and other similar terms provides an important framework through which to analyse the various elements of this phenomenon. This analysis has centred on the city of St Petersburg in this period for several reasons. Firstly, it was the seat of both the Russian government and the Court around a decade after its foundation and Peter I ensured its rapid population. Secondly, as a 'new' city, it was a space that could be consciously planned and shaped, which had an impact on both the everyday life of its population and the events which took place within the city. Thirdly, this period saw a considerable development in the socio-cultural life of the elite, effectively laying the foundations for the achievements of Catherine II's reign. Each of the chapters of the thesis focuses on a different element within the process of creating a 'public', such as the means by which people could be informed or policed by the State, the various 'public' spaces in which they could interact, and the behaviour and appearance thought appropriate for a person in 'public'. The intention is to show that, through the activities of institutions like the Court and the Academy of Sciences, State legislation and developments in personal education, it is possible to see the emergence of a multi-layered 'public' within St Petersburg society. However, access to and interaction within such 'public' spaces was mediated by a number of factors such as literacy, social standing, and wealth.

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
Acknowledgements	5
Abbreviations used in Footnotes and Bibliography	6
Introduction	7
Theories of the Public	9
Definitions of Public and Private	22
Eighteenth-Century Russian Society	26
Composition of a 'Public' in Russia	34
Chapter One - Locating the Public	39
Moscow and St Petersburg	40
Creating St Petersburg: A 'Regular' City?	44
Populating St Petersburg	49
Influences on St Petersburg's Space	52
- Nature and its Uses	52
- A New Social Environment	56
- Festive and Religious Activities	59
- Academic Pursuits	62
The Image of St Petersburg	67
Chapter Two - Controlling the Public	70
Police Administration and Social Discipline	70
Police in St Petersburg	74
Drinking	78
Gambling	86
Chapter Three - Organising the Public: The Court and its Activities	93
The Court as Institution	95
Public Celebrations	100
- The Calendar and Regular Celebrations	100
- Coronations	104
- Weddings	105
- Funerals	116
- Fireworks	119

Reporting Court Events	122
Chapter Four - Social Spaces and the Public	129
Theatre Audiences	130
Musical Entertainments	139
Masquerades	143
The Imperial Gardens and the Question of Accessibility	157
Everyday Social Life of the Elite	164
Popular Entertainments	168
Chapter Five - Forming and Informing the Public: The Public Self	174
Education	175
The Reading Public	187
Conduct Literature	194
Dance	202
Clothing and Accessories	208
Conclusion	223
Bibliography	226
Appendix One - Key to Maps	251
Map 1 - St Petersburg, 1725	252
Map 2 - St Petersburg, 1753	253

Acknowledgements

This thesis would simply not have been possible without the involvement of a large number of individuals and academic institutions. The Arts and Humanities Research Council were responsible for providing the funding, without which this project would have taken a very different path. In the United Kingdom, I am indebted to the staff of the School of Slavonic and East European Studies library and the British Library for their help. During my research leave in Russia, I worked in a variety of archives and libraries. I found their staff generally helpful and efficient, and the materials that they provided access have been crucial to my research. These institutions were: RGADA, RGIA, RGVIA, the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences in St Petersburg, the National Library of Russia, the State Public Library, the State Public Historical Library, the Academy of Sciences Library, and the State Theatrical Library.

Most Ph.D. students would consider themselves lucky to have one good supervisor, whereas I have had the privilege to work with two. Roger Bartlett was the main driving force behind the first two years of my research and Lindsey Hughes was responsible for ensuring that it reached a successful conclusion. In both cases, their continued support and advice has been invaluable. On an individual basis, I would also like to thank Wendy Rosslyn, Gary Marker, Janet Hartley, Simon Dixon and Richard Butterwick, all of whom have offered useful comments on part or all of the thesis. The Study Group on Eighteenth Century Russia provided the opportunity to present some of my early conclusions in a friendly and constructive atmosphere, for which I am very grateful. Whilst in Russia, my research work was made considerably more productive thanks to Ol'ga Kosheleva, Aleksandr Kamenskii, Evgenii Anisimov and Boris Morozov, whose advice on the material and topic I was working on was very welcome in an unfamiliar setting. During my time as a Ph.D. student, I have had the good fortune to enjoy the company of very capable peers, namely Derek Brower, Emma Minns, Antonia Napp and Mark Sutcliffe. The opportunity to talk through common experiences and problems with such friends was greatly appreciated. Chris Butler and Mike Ward kindly gave their time and advice on the more technical aspects of producing this thesis.

Finally, and most importantly from a personal point of view, I would like to thank my parents and brothers, my fiancée, Róisín, and her daughter Naoimh for their love and understanding during the last four years. This thesis is dedicated to all of you.

Abbreviations used in Footnotes and Bibliography

Printed Sources

<i>ChOidr</i>	<i>Chteniia v Imperatorskom Obshchestve Istorii i Drevnostei Rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete</i> (Moscow: Universitetskaia Tip., 1846-1918), 258 vols.
<i>KFZh</i>	<i>Zhurnal Kamer-fur'erskii, 1726-1771 goda</i> , ed. by B. M. Fedorov (St Petersburg: [private], 1853-55), 40 pts.
<i>PoZh</i>	<i>Pokhodnye i putevye zhurnaly imperatora Petra I-go, 1695-1726</i> , ed. by A. Th. Bychkov (St Petersburg: [private], 1853-55), 32 pts.
<i>PrZh</i>	<i>Pridvornye zhurnaly... 1741-42, 1743-48</i> , ed. by Ivan A Cherkasov (St Petersburg: Obshchii arkhiv Ministerstva imp. Dvora, 1883 & 1913).
<i>PSZ</i>	<i>Polnoe sobranie zakonov rossiiskoi imperii... 1649-1825</i> (St Petersburg: Senatskaia Tip., 1830), 40 vols.
<i>SIRIO</i>	<i>Sbornik Imperatorskogo Rossiiskogo Istoricheskogo Obshchestva</i> (St Petersburg: Tip. Imp. Akademii Nauk, 1867-1926), 148 vols.
<i>SK</i>	<i>Svodnyi katalog katalog russkoi knigi grazhdanskoi pečhati XVIII veka, 1725-1800</i> , ed. by I. P. Kondakov et al. (Moscow: Izd. gos. Biblioteki SSSR, 1962-67), 5 vols.
<i>StPb Ved.</i>	<i>Sanktpeterburgskie Vedomosti</i>
<i>ZhDA</i>	<i>Zhurnaly dezhurnykh general-ad''iutantov: tsarstvovanie imperatritsy Elizavety Petrovny</i> , comp. by Leonid V. Evdokimov (St Petersburg: Tip. Obshchestvennaia pol'za, 1897).

Archives

RGADA	Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv drevnikh aktov
RGIA	Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv
StPb IRI RAN	Sanktpeterburgskii filial Instituta Rossiiskoi Istorii Rossiiskoi Akademii Nauk

Archival references

f.	fond
op.	opis'
d.	delo
kn.	kniga
l. or ll.	list(y)

Introduction

... но ныне видим и самого Его Величество немецким языком глаголющего и несколько тысячей поданных Его Российского народа, мужеска и женска полу, искусных разных Европейских языков, яко же Латинского, Греческого, Французского, Немецкого, Итальянского, Аглинского, и Галанского, и такого при том обхождения что непостыдно могут равняться со всеми другими Европейскими народу.¹

... but now we see even His Majesty speaking in the German language and several thousand of His subjects of the Russian nation, male and female, skilled in various European languages, such as Latin, Greek, French, German, Italian, English and Dutch, and with such manners that they are not ashamed to compare themselves with all other European peoples.²

This quotation is taken from Petr P. Shafirov's justification of Russia's role in the Great Northern War against Sweden, which was first published in 1717 and subsequently reprinted several times over the next five years, with a total print-run of 20,000 by 1723.³ Given the large number of copies, this was a work clearly intended for widespread dissemination, also reflected by the fact that it was translated into both German and English during this period. Although the majority of these remained unsold, evidence suggests that around 4000 copies were distributed by the mid eighteenth century, with inscriptions in surviving examples indicating that they were owned not only by military officers and officials, but also merchants.⁴ Leaving aside the significance of the *Razsuzhdenie* as the first work of international law produced in Russia,⁵ the above passage was an important statement about the changes within Russian society, and in particular the elite, under Peter I. My intention is to show that this educated group, which was identified not only by contemporary writers, but also State institutions, such as the Court, and addressed either through legislation or other

1. Petr P. Shafirov, *Dedikatsiia ili Prinoshenie*, in *Razsuzhdenie, kakie zakonnye prichiny Ego Velichestvo Petr Velikii, Imperator i Samoderzhets Vserossiiskii ... k nachatiu voiny protiv Korolia Karola XII Shvedskago 1700 godu imel* (St Petersburg: Senatskaia tip., 1717), p. 5.

2. Author's translation, with thanks to Lindsey Hughes.

3. *Opisanie izdaniia grazhdanskoi pečati, 1708 - ianvar' 1725 g.*, comp. by T. A. Bykova and M. M. Gurevich (Moscow and Leningrad: Akademii nauk SSSR, 1955), pp. 219-20, 265 and 398-99.

4. James Cracraft, *The Petrine Revolution in Russian Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2004), pp. 185-86.

5. For a discussion of this, see William E. Butler's introduction to Petr P. Shafirov, *A Discourse concerning the Just Causes of the War between Sweden and Russia: 1700-1721*, ed. by William E. Butler (Dobbs Ferry, NY: Oceana Publications, 1973), pp. 6-14.

publications, is an important focus for studying the emergence of a 'public' during the first half of the eighteenth century.

The study of social concepts like 'public opinion' and 'civil society' has become more prevalent in recent years and, whilst this has facilitated my approach to this subject, there is still considerable debate on the extent to which a 'public' actually existed in Imperial Russia.⁶ This introductory chapter looks at the theoretical underpinnings behind the idea of a 'public'. The standard starting point for any discussion of the eighteenth-century 'public' in general is the influential work of the German sociologist and philosopher, Jürgen Habermas, which focussed on the rise and fall of the bourgeois 'public sphere', or *Öffentlichkeit* in the original German.⁷ His theory has arguably had greater impact in the years following its translation into English than in the thirty years previous to that, not least due to the implications that his model of the 'public' has for the historical study of eighteenth-century social, political and cultural norms.⁸ Although it will become clear that Habermas's model cannot be applied uncritically, especially in relation to the flaws in its historical chronology and its discussion of the relationship between the 'public' and the state, for our purposes it is important to understand exactly what Habermas' theory highlights about the development of a wider 'public', rather than the 'bourgeois' public sphere which his work focuses on. As a result, other theories which are applicable will be used to supplement the discussion. The main example of this is in relation to the development of the Court as the leading influence on 'public' life in St Petersburg during the first half of the eighteenth century, using the work of Norbert Elias on the 'civilising process' and 'courtly spectacle'. Related to this are studies on behaviour, based on historical sociology, and how they relate to eighteenth-century concepts of sociability, politeness and public interaction.

6. For two recent discussions on this subject, see Joseph Bradley, 'Subjects into Citizens: Societies, Civil Society, and Autocracy in Tsarist Russia', *American Historical Review*, vol. 107, no. 4 (2002), pp. 1094-1123 and Elise Kimerling Wirtschafter, 'The Search for Society in Eighteenth-Century Russia', *Study Group on Eighteenth-Century Russia Newsletter*, no. 30 (2002), pp. 24-33.

7. Jürgen Habermas, *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit: Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft* (Neuwied and Berlin: Luchterhand, 1962), published in English as *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, transl. by Thomas Burger (Oxford: Polity Press, 1989).

8. For an example of the considerable number of areas that the 'public sphere' has been used to discuss in relation to eighteenth-century studies, see James van Horn Melton, *The Rise of the Public in Enlightenment Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

Having established the main theoretical models relating to the 'public', it will then be necessary to discuss the origins and contemporary definitions of the word and other related concepts, such as 'society', in eighteenth-century Russian. In particular, the fact that 'public' was introduced as a foreign loan-word indicates that it began as a concept unfamiliar to Russians. The subsequent use of the term in both official and personal accounts gives some indication as to how it was viewed during this period. The relationship between the State and the main groups in urban Russian society will then be examined, with a view to establishing the composition and social context of the Russian 'public'. The focus will be on three main social groups - the nobility, the inhabitants of Russian towns, and women - each of whom experienced considerable change during this period, particularly from the reign of Peter I onwards, and who could be said to have formed key parts of a Russian 'public'. The final section of the chapter will set out a broad plan of the areas to be covered in the rest of the thesis and how the argument relates to the existing historiography dealt with in this Introduction.

Theories of the Public

Habermas begins his discussion of the origins of the public sphere with the re-emergence of the Classical model of public authority, wherein 'publicness' was a reflection of a person's elevated social status and position within the state administration. This 'representative publicness' was primarily centred on the person of the monarch. A corollary of this was the development of the early modern court as the heart of 'civilised society' in which the nobility served to reflect the monarch's glory, which in turn saw the emergence of the humanist-educated courtier in early modern Italy. This type of court culture gradually spread across Western Europe, and was to find its highest form of expression during the late seventeenth century, in particular at the court of Louis XIV of France. New forms of dress and behaviour became associated with this public nature, in effect a re-emergence of the Classical virtue associated with public activities.⁹ However, during the same period, the development of 'modern' capitalist economies in Europe had a major impact in three key areas. Firstly, the invention of the printing press and other improvements in communications allowed more frequent and efficient means of relaying information of commercial significance

9. Habermas, *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, pp. 3-10.

and prompted the development of the news press in the early seventeenth century. Secondly, the economic changes and the growing expense of state activities, particularly warfare, led to the creation of centralised, bureaucratic administrations in early modern Europe, which shifted the focus of government away from the royal court, which became the monarch's private concern. Thirdly, a new bourgeoisie emerged, consisting of state officials, professionals and scholars together with the wealthier merchants and bankers, who were both encouraged by the State, which hoped to regulate their activities, and critical of it, for its intervention in matters which were thought not to concern it.¹⁰

The appearance of new social spaces in the seventeenth century, particularly those associated with the bourgeoisie, such as the coffee house, and new means of expression, making use of the advances in printing, such as the satirical journals of Addison and Steele, gave rise to a new type of public discourse. In the course of the eighteenth century, the new sociability of the nobility eventually served to separate them from the court, and freedom of religion in certain states meant that the Church, to an extent, became another private concern. The term 'public' in this period was used to apply to the areas of wider state interest, beyond the interests of either the ruler or any of the social estates, and in particular to the people affected by state policy. The 'bourgeois' public sphere, which gradually emerged from the new social spaces and was informed by the press, was a forum for rational-critical discussion separate from both the state and the Church, as a result of which it could exercise a degree of political authority through 'impartial' public opinion.¹¹ Habermas's work can also be linked to the earlier work of another Frankfurt scholar, Reinhart Koselleck, whose book on a related theme appeared three years before the original publication of *Strukturwandel*.¹² Although the conclusions of the two men were quite different, it is important to note the similarities and differences of their approaches. For example, both men developed the notion of a critical public emerging from the private sphere, but rather than sharing Habermas's commercial origins, Koselleck instead located it in the development of private

10. Habermas, *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, pp. 14-26.

11. Habermas, *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, pp. 32-33 and 42-43

12. Reinhart Koselleck, *Kritik und Krise: ein beitrag zur pathogenese der bürgerlichen welt* (Freiburg: K. Alber, 1959), translated as *Critique and Crisis: Enlightenment and the Pathogenesis of Modern Society* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1988).

conscience amongst those excluded from politics and who created new social spaces in which to express their views.¹³ Similarly, Koselleck's main concern was the hypocrisy embodied by the tension between the alleged public nature of these spaces, which convinced these groups of their own 'public' morality, and the essentially exclusive nature of their political views, whereas Habermas's work concluded that consumerism had ultimately undermined the independence of the 'bourgeois' public sphere.¹⁴

Bearing in mind that *Strukturwandel* was originally written over forty years ago, it is hardly surprising that its model of the public sphere has come under critical scrutiny in the considerable body of scholarship that it has prompted in a number of disciplines.¹⁵ It is important to bear in mind that Habermas considered the 'bourgeois' public sphere to be 'historically specific' to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, rather than something that could be applied generally.¹⁶ However, the chronology which underpins his theory is flawed, placing the political journalism and coffee-house culture of seventeenth-century and early eighteenth-century England alongside the household setting of the later eighteenth-century Sentimental novels.¹⁷ This highlights another limitation of Habermas's analysis, in that it was focussed on two main areas; England in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, which was clearly the ideal example, and France in the latter half of the eighteenth century, although he also briefly looked at the German states of the later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.¹⁸ In addition to these limitations, there are other problems with Habermas's approach. For example, his essentially Marxist viewpoint on the historical development of the public sphere has been criticised as anachronistic, in particular its socio-economic approach to essentially cultural phenomena, and this has led several scholars to focus critically on the extent to

13. Koselleck, *Critique and Crisis*, pp. 6-12.

14. For an informed discussion of both Habermas and Koselleck's work in this respect, see Anthony J. LaVopa, 'Conceiving a Public: Ideas and Society in Eighteenth-Century Europe', *Journal of Modern History*, vol. 64 (1992), pp. 83-85 and 93.

15. Two collections devoted to the application of Habermas's model in a variety of historical and theoretical settings, highlighting its inter-disciplinary applicability, are *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, ed. by Craig Calhoun (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992) and *Shifting the Boundaries: The Transformation of Languages of Public and Private in the Eighteenth Century*, ed. by Dario Castiglione and Lesley Sharpe (Exeter: Exeter University Press, 1995).

16. Keith Michael Baker, 'Defining the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century France: Variation on a Theme by Habermas', in Calhoun (ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, p. 182 and 189.

17. Melton, *The Rise of the Public*, pp. 10-11.

18. Habermas, *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, pp. 57-73.

which the public sphere can be considered 'bourgeois' in the eighteenth century.¹⁹

The contemporary understanding of 'the public' has been a focus of the debate surrounding Habermas. Vadim Volkov looks at the issue of the public from a sociological point of view, drawing on the work of Jeff Weintraub. Starting from the established, modern oppositional definition of the public, wherein the public is open, visible and accessible, as opposed to the closed, concealed and inaccessible private, Weintraub explores the possible uses of this public/ private distinction in the social sciences. These can include the public as the realm of state authority, the wider political and civil community, or as a realm of sociability. Habermas's theory can be placed in the latter category, although Volkov notes that this does not prevent the sociable public later forming the basis of a rational and inclusive political authority.²⁰ However, the modern public/private distinction is anachronistic when applied to the eighteenth-century setting, and historians have adopted a more cautious approach, taking account of contemporary attitudes and definitions.²¹ Goodman examines Philippe Ariès's work on the history of private life, in which he focused on the gradual rise of the individual (private) at the expense of the community (public) within the early modern state. As part of this process, he examined how previously private social spaces, such as salons, the Académies and Masonic lodges, and their forms of expression, namely *sociabilité* and public opinion, became increasingly important in public life during the eighteenth century.²² These areas also constituted the 'authentic' part of Habermas's 'bourgeois' public sphere and Goodman argues that the degree of overlap between public and private in terms of space and expression in this period weakens Habermas's attempt to contrast them.²³

19. See, for example, Keith Michael Baker, *Inventing the French Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 167-99 and Roger Chartier, *The Cultural Origins of the French Revolution* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1991), pp. 20-32. For a useful case study on the 'bourgeois' element in relation to France, see Colin Jones, 'The Great Chain of Buying: Medical Advertisement, the Bourgeois Public Sphere and the Origins of the French Revolution', *American Historical Review*, vol. 101, no. 1 (1996), pp. 17-26.

20. Vadim Volkov, 'The Forms of Public Life: The Public Sphere and the Concept of Society in Imperial Russia', unpublished Ph.D. thesis (Wolfson College: University of Cambridge, 1995), pp. 5-6.

21. Elise Kimerling Wirtschafter, 'In Search of the People, In Search of Russia', *Russian Review*, vol. 60 (2001), p. 500.

22. Philippe Ariès, 'Introduction' to *A History of Private Life, Volume III: Passions of the Renaissance*, ed. by Roger Chartier, transl. by Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1987), pp. 9-11 and Dena Goodman, 'Public Sphere and Private Life: Towards a Synthesis of Current Historiographical Approaches to the Old Regime', *History and Theory*, vol. 31 (1992), pp. 9-10.

23. Goodman, 'Public Sphere and Private Life', p. 14 and Habermas, *Structural Transformation of the*

The oppositional interpretation has been particularly strong in the feminist critique of Habermas, led by Joan Landes's work on the women and the public sphere during the French Revolution. The central thesis, that women were excluded from participating in public political life due to their association with private home life, presents the binary opposition between public and private in gendered and explicitly political terms.²⁴ Both Goodman and Klein have pointed out that, as a result of this, Landes marginalised the roles actually played by women in eighteenth-century public cultural life, as translators, *salonnières* and actresses.²⁵ Social settings such as the salon also reveal the porous boundaries between public and private in the eighteenth century. Salons had developed out of Renaissance court culture as an semi-autonomous space in which both men and women could enjoy music, literature and polite conversation in a comparatively informal setting. The *salonnière*, as the organiser and director of proceedings, was a key role for women.²⁶ However Maza acknowledges that, although Landes 'skews' the role of public women in eighteenth-century France, they were still clearly subordinate in most social situations and even the salon setting imposed limitations on their participation. Women were seen as conducive to polite conversation but were often excluded from contributing on 'serious' topics. Similarly, they were considered the inspiration for literature, rather than its authors. This reflected their association with the image of feminine virtue, which included modesty. As a result, they were often prevented from engaging in such activities, since it carried the risk of damaging their reputation.²⁷ Also, although women were at the heart of salon culture, it should be remembered that, even in France, this applied only to a small number of well-established women, such as Madame Geoffrin.²⁸

An important aspect of Habermas's work is that the expression of public opinion was identified with objective rationality, in contrast to the subjective opinion associated

Public Sphere, pp. 27-30 (with diagram).

24. Joan Landes, *Women and the Public Sphere in the Age of the Enlightenment* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994).

25. Goodman, 'Public Sphere and Private Life', pp. 14-17 and Lawrence E. Klein, 'Gender and the Public/Private Distinction in the Eighteenth Century: Some Questions about Evidence and Analytic Procedure', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 29, no. 1 (1995), pp. 97-109.

26. Melton, *The Rise of the Public*, pp. 198-202.

27. Dena Goodman, *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment* (Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press, 1994), pp. 99-103.

28. Sarah Maza, 'Women, the Bourgeoisie, and the Public Sphere: Response to Daniel Gordon and David Bell', *French Historical Studies*, vol. 17, no. 4 (1992), pp. 945-49.

with other social groups and the arbitrary nature of some state organs. For example, it was this aspect of public opinion which was appealed to by the various parties during the economic debate in late eighteenth-century France.²⁹ Harold Mah has criticised the tendency of historians and other scholars to use Habermas's work as a means to examine the attempts of politically-weak social groups, like women or ethnic minorities, to express their views through access to the public sphere.³⁰ This reading of Habermas overlooks the fact that the various groups in question had other means of social and cultural expression, which can be considered as distinct from Habermas's envisioned rational-critical space. As an example, Mah highlights E. P. Thompson's *The Making of the English Working Class* (1964), published shortly after Habermas's book, which examined the identity of this largely-overlooked nineteenth-century social group and their role as active participants in the cultural and political life of the period.³¹ This reading also ignores the fact that discussion within Habermas's 'bourgeois' public sphere took place with no regard for social background and privilege, enabling the perception of equality within it. Hence the transformation of which Habermas's work speaks - the point at which the various social groups come together as one, objective public.³²

Although Habermas's stress on the prominent role of the bourgeois has been questioned (see above), many of the studies of public life in eighteenth-century Europe have stressed the importance of urban development. Early modern Russia provides an interesting problem for this formulation, since it was predominantly a rural society, with officially registered urban inhabitants (*posadskie liudi*) remaining at around 3% of the overall population between 1719-62, according to the *reviziia* conducted in those years.³³ Although towns also contained a number of other social groups, such as the nobility and clergy, proportionately the urban population in Russia was still much smaller than in many other European states. In particular, the fact that peasants were the largest social group in Russian towns had an acknowledged impact on urban

29. LaVopa, 'Conceiving a Public', pp. 79-80 and Baker, 'Defining the Public Sphere', pp. 190-97.

30. Harold Mah, 'Phantasies of the Public Sphere: Rethinking the Habermas of Historians', *Journal of Modern History*, vol. 72 (2000), pp. 156-63.

31. A fact which Habermas himself acknowledged in his 'Further Reflections on the Public Sphere', in Calhoun (ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, pp. 425-27.

32. Mah, 'Phantasies of the Public Sphere', pp. 164 and 166.

33. Aleksandr A. Kizeveter, *Posadskie obshchina v Rossii XVIII stoletii* (Moscow: Universitetskaia Tip., 1903), p. 113.

underdevelopment.³⁴ In his *Lettres russiennes*, Frédéric-Henri Strube de Piermont, a law professor at the Academy of Sciences, optimistically suggested that Russia possessed an urban equivalent to the French 'Third Estate', as part of his critique of Montesquieu's *De l'esprit des lois* (1748) and, in particular, his view of Russia as a despotism.³⁵ However, in her notes on Strube de Piermont's book, Catherine II revealed her poor opinion of the contemporary Russian urban population, referring to them as freed men, runaway serfs and vagrants.³⁶ Given the limitations of the census information that Catherine had access to, it is hardly surprising that she should have formed such a negative impression, since it appeared that the urban population had actually decreased since the 1740s. In a similar vein, the Commission on Commerce (1763-67) that Catherine established made the disturbing discovery that less than 50% of the registered urban population actually took part in commercial activity.³⁷ As a result, during Catherine II's reign, several projects were devised to tackle the problem.³⁸

Therefore, given the small and relatively under-developed nature of Russian towns well into the eighteenth century, there is little sense in which their inhabitants can be compared to the nascent bourgeoisie in Western Europe, and they were certainly not in either a social, political or financial position to develop a socio-cultural sphere distinct from the state.³⁹ This latter point raises another issue concerning the existence of a 'public' in Russia, namely the extent to which it can legitimately be considered distinct or independent from the state. However, the oppositional contrast drawn between 'civil society' and the state in Habermas's work has been criticised as anachronistic, as the relationship between the two was considerably more complex. Much of the influential work on the concept of 'civil society' during the eighteenth

34. Janet Hartley, *A Social History of the Russian Empire, 1650-1825* (London and New York: Longman, 1999), pp. 164-65.

35. Frédéric-Henri Strube de Piermont, *Lettres russiennes* (St Petersburg: [private], 1760), pp. 218-20.

36. Catherine II, *Zapiski imperatritsy Ekateriny vtoroi* (Moscow: Orbita, 1989), pp. 683-84.

37. David M. Griffiths, 'Eighteenth-Century Perceptions of Backwardness: Projects for the Creation of a Third Estate in Catherinean Russia', *Canadian-American Slavic Studies*, vol. 13, no. 4 (1979), pp. 455-56.

38. For a discussion of these projects, see Griffiths, 'Eighteenth-Century Perceptions of Backwardness', passim and Hugh D. Hudson Jr., 'Urban Estate Engineering in Eighteenth-Century Russia: Catherine the Great and the Elusive *Meshchanstvo*', *Canadian-American Slavic Studies*, vol. 18 (1984), pp. 393-410.

39. A point acknowledged in Aleksandr B. Kamenskii, 'Russian and Western Eighteenth-Century Towns: Possible Aspects of Comparison', in *Russian Society and Culture and the Long Eighteenth Century: Essays in Honour of Anthony G. Cross*, ed. by Roger P. Bartlett and Lindsey Hughes (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2004), p. 62.

century was by Scottish writers, such as Adam Ferguson, who sought to examine its origins in his work, *An Essay on the History of Civil Society* (1767). These ideas were also discussed in contemporary England and throughout Europe, with a number of interpretations emerging as a result.⁴⁰ Some contemporaries associated ‘civil society’ with the role of the State in pursuing the ‘common good’, others linked it to moral self-development or individual endeavour, others still wrote of the need for legal regulation to formalise the relationship between the State and wider society. Furthermore, the high level of crossover between the membership of the State administration and ‘civil society’ in many of the German states makes any attempt to distinguish their activities and goals both difficult and teleological.⁴¹

Habermas’s model does not take account of the influence that the people who made up the ‘public’ may have had through their role in the state administration, and similarly that the State may have found their ‘public’ activities beneficial and therefore encouraged them.⁴² Margaret Jacobs has highlighted the efforts of both individuals and institutions, including literary salons and scientific societies, to avoid political confrontation in favour of precisely this type of ‘useful’ activities and disseminating information to a wider audience.⁴³ In most parts of Europe during the eighteenth century, the state and the public were mutually supportive. The development of the ‘public’ itself relied considerably on the actions of the State, not least in creating favourable conditions for commerce, reforming education and patronising key elements in the public forum, such as art, music and the theatre.⁴⁴ In relation to Russia, despite the traditional view that its autocratic regime stifled any prospective ‘civil society’, recent work on the emergence of voluntary associations during the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries has suggested that the two were not mutually exclusive.⁴⁵ Similarly,

40. See, for example, Marvin B. Becker, *The Emergence of Civil Society in the Eighteenth Century: A Privileged Moment in the History of England, Scotland, and France* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1994) and Fania Oz-Salzberger, *Translating the Enlightenment: Scottish Civic Discourse in Eighteenth-Century Germany* (Oxford and New York: Clarendon Press, 1995).

41. Isabel V. Hull, *Sexuality, State and Civil Society in Germany, 1700-1815* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996), pp. 204-5.

42. Bradley, ‘Subjects into Citizens’, p. 1099.

43. Margaret C. Jacob, ‘The Mental Landscape of the Public Sphere: A European Perspective’, *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 28, no. 1 (1994), pp. 102-3.

44. T. C. W. Blanning, *The Culture of Power and the Power of Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 13.

45. Bradley, ‘Subjects into Citizens’, pp. 1102-5.

the State played a key role in the development of Russian elite culture through the reforms introduced by Peter I (discussed below), and this process was consolidated during the reign of Catherine II.⁴⁶

A key area of the State's involvement in wider 'public' life was through the activities of the ruler's court. Certainly the Muscovite Court, with its emphasis on formal and highly-symbolic ritual, particularly in relation to the major feasts of the Orthodox calendar, fits solidly within Habermas's formulation of 'representative publicness'. The ceremonies often stressed the close relationship between the tsar and the Church, whilst the participation of the members of the Court elite, in particular the boyar families, served to confirm both the tsar's status and their own.⁴⁷ Traditionally there has been a debate about the extent to which one can talk about a 'Court' during the reign of Peter I, given the demands of the Great Northern War and his alleged rejection of Muscovite tradition.⁴⁸ However, more recently, it has been pointed out that, although the Petrine Court was different to many of its European contemporaries, they nevertheless had elements in common, particularly in the aforementioned area of Court celebrations. One of the dominant themes of such celebrations in early modern Europe was to emphasise the power and glory of the ruler, with the result that they have been referred to in a leading study as 'scenarios of power'. Wortman's work has demonstrated how the Russian Court fitted into this wider European context from Peter's reign onwards.⁴⁹ A further development in this area was the move to widen access to such celebrations in Russia, either by means of the visual and aural elements, such as illuminations or cannon fire, or through publications, carrying descriptions and images of such occasions. The development of the Court as an institution and the public aspects of its celebrations will be discussed in Chapter Three.

Another useful model for studying the activities of the eighteenth-century Russian

46. Simon Dixon, *Catherine the Great* (London and New York: Longman, 2001), p. 102.

47. Robert O. Crummey, 'Court Spectacles in Seventeenth-Century Russia: Illusion and Reality', in *Essays in Honour of A. A. Zimin*, ed. by Daniel Clarke Waugh (Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers, 1985), pp. 130-158.

48. For an example of this view, see M. S. Anderson, 'Peter the Great: Imperial Revolutionary?', in *The Courts of Europe: Politics, Patronage and Royalty, 1400-1800*, ed. by A. G. Dickens (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977), p. 276.

49. Richard S. Wortman, *Scenarios of Power: Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy, Volume One: From Peter the Great to the Death of Nicholas I* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995), pp. 6-7.

Court is provided by Norbert Elias's pioneering work on the 'civilising process', in which he charts the gradual development of a non-violent means of social interaction from the Middle Ages and the cultural effects that this change entailed.⁵⁰ Elias's analysis of the civilising, exemplary nature of 'courtly spectacle', through which the Court gradually spread new ideas on social decorum and polite interaction to the aristocracy, clearly has parallels with the aforementioned 'representative publicness', although Elias's work is better grounded in the context of early modern Europe. Both Elias and Habermas also identify the gradual shift away from the aristocracy's use of 'civilized' behaviour as a reflection of their social status to a more inclusive 'sociable' process, in which the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie worked together to produce an agreed form of 'proper' behaviour in certain social settings.⁵¹ In Russia, it was during the reign of Peter I that a number of important social and cultural innovations were introduced. For example, the tsar enforced changes to the manner of everyday and formal dress/grooming and oversaw the introduction of mixed company social evenings with new forms of entertainment, such as dancing.

The location of the Court in St Petersburg for much of this period also had an important influence on these developments, in terms of the city's distinctive space, as compared with Moscow, for example. St Petersburg had not only distinct physical characteristics, such as its regular planning and the importance of the river Neva and other waterways, but also social, reflected to an extent in the close proximity of noble houses and the introduction of new forums, such as the *assamblei* in 1718. This influence will be discussed further in Chapter One. The process of change was subsequently consolidated by Peter's successors, particularly in relation to areas that he had little personal interest in, as demonstrated by the development of the Court theatre. This was also a process of refinement as the tastes of both the Russian ruler and the elite developed to remove some of the rougher edges, noted by numerous foreign observers during this period. The development of these social spaces, particularly in the reigns of the empresses Anna and Elizabeth, is the focus of Chapter Four, whilst a number of aspects of the Russian elite's development will be examined in Chapter Five.

The formation of a 'public' can also be conditioned by the behaviour and other

50. Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process [Revised Edition]*, ed. and transl. by Edmund Jephcott (London: Blackwell, 2000), ix-xiii.

51. Elias, *The Civilizing Process*, pp. 421-35 and Habermas, *Structural Transformation*, pp. 31-36.

activities of the individuals who constitute this wider body within society as a whole. However, given the limited nature of Russian memoir literature and other personal writings from this period, it is often difficult to judge contemporary views on the nature of 'public' life and the role of the individual within it. However Volkov highlights the importance of the 'sociology of everyday life', in particular the work of Erving Goffman, in providing a means of extrapolating the missing or partial details.⁵² It suggests that an individual's behaviour within a 'civilised' society is modified by the desire to 'fit in', rather than to dominate by means of physical force, a phenomenon noted above in relation to Elias's work on the Court. The social situations in such a setting contain a number of references, which inform the individual on how to act. These can be both visible and invisible, conscious and unconscious. For example, body language, although not the prime focus of most interpersonal contacts, can have a major impact on a conversation or a public speech. Although such references can take a written form, as in etiquette manuals and conduct literature, more often they simply reflected tacitly agreed behaviour based on common experiences.⁵³

Goffman's work also raises the question of social roles, which inform an individual's behaviour in a given situation. He believed that, in an urban setting, wherein one would encounter a larger number of strangers than in a rural community, an individual will assume a public self, a role constructed to be considered acceptable by his or her 'audience' and therefore modified by their reactions to it.⁵⁴ The use of social skills (such as manners or acceptable conventions) can also be used as a means of hiding one's social origins. However, Richard Sennett has criticised the 'static' nature of the social situations analysed by Goffman which fail to trace the evolution of 'acceptable' social roles and therefore show how they changed in different periods.⁵⁵ This concept of 'proper behaviour' and its historical development is another aspect of Elias's work on the 'civilizing process', which makes use of advice literature from the Middle Ages to the eighteenth century.⁵⁶ Such works were introduced to Russia in the

52. Volkov, 'The Forms of Public Life', pp. 21-23.

53. Erving Goffman, *Behaviour in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organisation of Gatherings* (Glencoe, NY: The Free Press, 1963), p. 11.

54. Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (London: Allen Lane, 1969) and Volkov, 'The Forms of Public Life', pp. 27-28.

55. Richard Sennett, *The Fall of Public Man* (London: Faber and Faber, 1986), pp. 36-37.

56. Elias, *The Civilizing Process*, pp. 47-172.

early eighteenth century and will be discussed in Chapter Five. The key for this kind of social interaction is the validity attributed to these roles in a given setting. If they are rejected as ‘affected’ or ‘false’ then, Sennett argues, social interaction becomes less expressive and consequently more difficult in a wider ‘public’ setting. Establishing the value placed on these roles and skills in a given historical setting can be very difficult, since they rely on a system of situation-specific beliefs.⁵⁷ Nevertheless he recognises the importance of this theatrical presentation of self in eighteenth-century social situations, and it is this aspect of Goffman’s work which has further implications in the Russian setting.

Iurii Lotman’s work on the ‘theatricality’ of elite Russian behaviour during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries established a link between everyday life and a lifestyle inspired by literary texts. He argued that the usual division in most developed cultures is between everyday and ceremonial behaviour, but what had been considered everyday behaviour in the seventeenth century was considered ‘unacceptable’ for Peter’s planned reforms at the turn of the eighteenth century. The changes in the clothing and grooming of the Petrine elite were followed by the state’s introduction of Western models of ‘acceptable’ behaviour. Education played a key part in this process, with the introduction of new elements which would prove useful in a social setting, such as dancing and foreign languages, and the publication of the first Russian conduct literature, in the form of the *Iunosti chestnoe zertsalo* (1717), which was based on Western sources.⁵⁸ Both of these areas will be examined in more detail in Chapter Five. These combined with the emergence of new social settings, mentioned above in relation to the Court, to realign the everyday life of the elite. However Lotman argues that these efforts to alter one’s everyday life were not fully assimilated by the Russian elite, but instead were kept as a foreign imitation. In other words, the Russian elite were conscious of being Russians acting like Europeans, with foreign behaviour providing a ‘role’, foreign clothing a ‘costume’ and the new social gatherings a ‘stage’ for their theatrical behaviour.⁵⁹

57. Sennett, *The Fall of Public Man*, pp. 29-34.

58. Iurii M. Lotman, ‘The Poetics of Everyday Behavior in Russian Eighteenth-Century Culture’, in Iurii M. Lotman and Boris A. Uspenskii, *The Semiotics of Russian Culture*, ed. and transl. by Ann Shukman (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, 1984), pp. 231-33.

59. Lotman, ‘The Poetics of Everyday Behavior’, pp. 234-35.

However, whilst this semiotic approach can be a useful means to interpret some aspects of eighteenth-century culture, this is tempered by a lack of sufficient documentary evidence in certain areas, such as theatricality, particularly for the first half of the eighteenth century. The memoirs and other personal writings which survive from this period do not discuss the subject of personal consciousness, and it is therefore difficult to gauge the extent to which the writers felt 'Russian' or 'foreign'. Lotman's work has also been used to suggest that Russian elite culture in the eighteenth century was informed by the 'falsity of the sign', hence the popularity of masquerade and other forms of 'false' behaviour, in contrast to mediaeval Russia, when signs (particularly icons and other holy objects) had carried enormous meaning and importance.⁶⁰ This deliberate cultivation of 'falsity' was part of a wider attempt to break decisively with the past and create a new set of cultural norms in Russia, and has also been linked to Peter I's fondness for mock rituals, such as the activities of the 'All-Drunken Assembly'.⁶¹ As with all interpretative models, the available evidence can be viewed in a number of ways and, in particular, recent work has moved away from the traditional Soviet view of the 'All-Drunken Assembly' as evidence of Peter's 'progressive' secularising tendencies.⁶² Rather, it has been suggested that Peter used a series of parodied sacred rituals in an effort to assert his 'charismatic authority' over his close circle and thus bind them to his wider vision of a new political order.⁶³

Overall, the theories discussed highlight the need to examine a wide variety of materials for evidence of a 'public' and participation in that 'public' in eighteenth-century Russia. Habermas's work was undoubtedly important in establishing the need to look for a 'public' in the eighteenth century, despite the problems highlighted with his theory. For example, whilst the rational-critical public sphere is a useful theoretical model, its practical applications are severely limited, as noted by Mah. The dangers of

60. Agnieszka Perlinska, 'A Semiotic Analysis of Eighteenth-Century Russian Culture: Discovering the Past and Modelling the Present', *Historical Reflections/ Réflexions Historiques*, vol. 18, no. 2 (1992), pp. 49-50.

61. On the All-Drunken Assembly, see Lidiia N. Semenova, *Ocherki istorii byta i kul'turnoi zhizni Rossii (pervaia polovina XVIII v.)* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1982), pp. 174-99. On the wider 'mock' elements during Peter's reign, see Lindsey Hughes, *Playing Games: The Alternative History of Peter the Great: Inaugural Lecture* (London: SSEES, 2000).

62. For further discussion, see Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, pp. 250-56 and James Cracraft, *The Church Reform of Peter the Great* (London: Macmillan, 1971), p. 14.

63. Ernest A. Zitser, *The Transfigured Kingdom: Sacred Parody and Charismatic Authority at the Court of Peter the Great* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004).

attempting to look at certain social groups in relation to their role within 'public' life can sometimes lead to the application of modern ideas in an anachronistic manner, as shown by Landes's study of women in late eighteenth-century France, although, as Goodman highlights, this criticism is also true of Habermas himself. The central problem with Habermas's model in relation to Russia is that it lacks sufficient development in a number of areas considered important for the existence of a 'public' in contemporary Europe, particularly with regard to the urban population and its forums for social interaction. However, a more useful approach has been suggested by a number of Habermas's critics, focussing on the contemporary definitions of the term 'public' in early eighteenth-century Russia and then examining the areas which it was used to describe. The other theories highlighted in this section, such as the 'civilising process' described by Elias and the various historico-sociological studies of behaviour, can be used to discuss these areas of 'public' activity in Russia and what was necessary to participate in them.

Definitions of Public and Private

The terminology used by contemporaries to discuss eighteenth-century society has been an important focus for recent work, and Russia has proved no exception.⁶⁴ The English word 'public' has its origins in Latin. The adjective *publicus* referred to the collective body of citizens (or subjects), in formulations like *res publica*, and shared property (like the streets), in contrast to the private household and its belongings. The noun form, *publicum*, was more specifically political and was used to refer to the state, as in 'public property' and 'public office'.⁶⁵ In Russian, the term *publika* was introduced during the reign of Peter I. As with many other words in the Petrine lexicography, it was essentially a foreign loan-word, which may have come to Russia either through the Polish *publika* or the German *publikum* (drawn from the Latin in both cases).⁶⁶ Definitions for the adjective *publichnyi* appeared in a glossary at the end of the *General'nyi Reglament* (1720), in which 'public' state affairs (*publichnyi*, defined as *vsenarodnyi*) were distinguished from 'private' (*privatnyi*, defined as *osoboï*) individual

64. Wirtschafter, 'In Search of the People', p. 500.

65. Melton, *The Rise of the Public*, p. 1.

66. For a useful summary of the various etymological studies on this term, see Cracraft, *Petrine Revolution in Russian Culture*, p. 424.

concerns.⁶⁷ It is interesting to note that, although *publika* and its derived terms (such as *publichnyi*) became part of official Russian vocabulary, *privatnyi* did not.⁶⁸

The definition of *publichnyi* as a means to describe official policies and regulations intended to apply to the populace as a whole was also reflected in publications later in the eighteenth century. For example, a foreign language lexicon translated by Sergei Volchikov in 1764, in which Russian equivalents were provided for French, German and Latin terms, linked the adjectives *public*, *gemein* and *publicus* to the Russian *publichnoi* (sic), but also provided the alternatives *prostoi* and *podloi*, implying the wider population.⁶⁹ However, during the same period, the term was also used to describe activities which were accessible by various groups of people. For example, the biweekly newspaper *Sanktpeterburgskie Vedomosti*, which will be examined in Chapter Five, frequently carried notices for goods being offered at *publichnye auktsii* (public auctions), which were presumably open to anyone with sufficient money to make a bid. At the same time, such people were certainly not the intended participants in the *publichnye maskarady* (public masquerades) organised by the Imperial Court during the reign of Elizabeth, the social composition of which will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Four. Similarly, the public reception (*publichnaia audientsiia*) of foreign ambassadors by the ruler was conducted entirely by members of the Court elite within the setting of the Imperial palaces. In each of these cases, the term *publichnyi* was used, even though the possibilities for access and participation differed significantly.

The noun form, *publika*, was used much less frequently in Russian during this period. It was defined in Russian dictionaries from later in the eighteenth century, such as Nordstedt's trilingual dictionary (1780-82), which provided German and French translations, linking *publika* to *le public* and *das Publicum*, with the latter being distinguished from both *der Staat* and *das Volk*.⁷⁰ However, the commonest application of the term was in relation to the theatre, as a means of describing the audience. For

67. *Reformy Petra Pervogo: sbornik dokumentov*, comp. by Vladimir I. Lebedev (Moscow: Gos. sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoe izd., 1937), p. 135.

68. Cracraft, *Petrine Revolution in Russian Culture*, p. 165.

69. *Novago voiazhirova leksikona na frantsuskom, nemetskom, latinskom i rossiiskom iazykakh*, transl. by Sergei Volchikov (St Petersburg: Tip. Imp. Akademii nauk, 1764), pt. 2, pp. 893-94.

70. 'Publika', in *Rossiiskii, s nemetskim i frantsuzskim perevodami, slovar'*, comp. by Ivan Nordstet (St Petersburg: Tip. I. K. Shnora, 1782), pt. 2.

example, an order relating to the Court theatre from the early 1750s made an explicit reference to the *publika*, describing the performance as

... для всей публики, то есть кто пожелает из дворянства и для всего купечества...⁷¹

Although the punctuation somewhat confuses the issue of which groups were covered by the term *publika*, it seems more likely that it was intended to describe the nobility, who formed the regular audience at such performances, and that permission was being extended to the merchantry on this occasion. However, the same term was also used to describe the paying audience for other theatrical performances, often in the same venues, whose attendance was only restricted by their ability to pay for the ticket and certain other requirements, often relating to appearance or behaviour. Therefore, as with *publichnyi*, the intended meaning of *publika* clearly depended on the social context in which it was used, although there were clearly overlaps between several of these areas, particularly in relation to the theatre.

Interestingly, neither *publika* nor the more common *publichnyi* appeared in the Dictionary of the Russian Academy (1789-1794).⁷² On the other hand, it included the term *obshchestvo*⁷³, which was often considered analogous to *publika* in the Russian setting - for example, in the famous nineteenth-century dictionary compiled by Vladimir Dal'⁷⁴. It has generally been translated as 'society', although it could carry a number of wider connotations. For example, it was used by Catherine II in the 'Charter to the Nobility' and the 'Charter to the Towns' in 1785 as a means of describing both of these social groups.⁷⁵ Freeze links this particular application to the idea of *soslovie*, broadly comparable to both *état* and *Stand*.⁷⁶ Interestingly, during the reign of Paul I, use of the

71. RGIA, f. 1329, op. 2, d. 48, l. 4 (23rd? Feb. 1756).

72. Douglas C. Smith, *Working the Rough Stone: Freemasonry and Society in Eighteenth-Century Russia* (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1999), pp. 56-57.

73. 'Obshchestvo', in *Slovar' Akademii Rossiiskoi, 1789-94*, ed. by G. A. Bogatova et al. (Moscow: MGII im. E. R. Dashkovoï, 2004), vol. 4, p. 601.

74. 'Obshchestvo', in *Tolkovyi slovar' zhivago velikorusskago iazyka*, comp. by Vladimir Dal' (St Petersburg and Moscow: Izd. M. O. Vol'fa, 1882), vol. 3, p. 535.

75. For a discussion of the term and its uses during the reign of Catherine II, see Ingrid Schierle, 'Zur politisch-sozialen Begriffssprache der Regierung Katharinas II. Gesellschaft und Gesellschaften: "obshchestvo"', in *Katharina II. Rußland und Europa: Beiträge zur internationalen Forschung*, ed. by Claus Scharf (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2001), pp. 275-306.

76. Gregory Freeze, 'The *Soslovie* (Estate) Paradigm and Russian Social History', *American Historical Review*, vol. 91, no. 1 (1986), p. 18.

word *obshchestvo* was banned by censorship *ukazy* issued between 1797-1800.⁷⁷ It was roughly equivalent to ‘society’ in England and *le monde* in France of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, also both elite terms, albeit with some important differences. For example, the link within *obshchestvo* between the political, social and cultural elite was more developed in Russia than in Western Europe. The term ‘public’, in the wider English sense of the word relating to ‘society’ or ‘community’, was more associated with the Russian word *obshchestvennost’*, which had emerged by the late nineteenth century, prompting a retrospective search for the origins of this educated elite in the later eighteenth century.⁷⁸

Wirtschafter refers to the term *obshchestvo* using Raeff’s definition of a ‘civil society of the educated’, although she stresses the exclusive nature of the educated elite and the lack of later political connotations (and, by implication, of the political role which Habermas and others assign to the eighteenth-century public) with regard to *obshchestvo* and, to a lesser extent, *obshchestvennost’* in the eighteenth-century context. She is also keen to stress the problematic nature of the concept of civil society in eighteenth-century Russia, warning against the use of modern or even nineteenth-century terms or definitions to apply to eighteenth-century phenomena.⁷⁹ However, in the context of late eighteenth-century Russia, *obshchestvo* was used either to describe Russian society as a whole (as a people bound by the same laws) or a more select group within that society, determined by other factors (status, education or language being clear distinctions).⁸⁰ Despite the debate over the exact social composition of *obshchestvo*, there was little conflict over who it was not, and this wider group were generally identified as the *narod*, broadly speaking the common people and therefore

77. Anthony Cross, ‘The Russian Literary Scene in the Reign of Paul I’, *Canadian-American Slavic Studies*, vol. 7, no. 1 (1973), pp. 39-40. For an example of this legislation, see ‘Rasporiazhenie imperatora Pavla ob iz’iatii iz upotrebleniia nekotorykh slov i zamene ikh drugimi’, comp. by G. K. Repinskii, *Russkaia starina*, tom 6, no. 7 (1872), p. 98.

78. Abbot Gleason, ‘The Terms of Russian Social History’, in *Between Tsar and People: Educated Society and the Quest for Public Identity in Late Imperial Russia*, ed. by Edith W. Clowes, Samuel D. Kossow and James L. West (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991), pp. 18-20.

79. Wirtschafter, ‘In Search of the People’, pp. 500-1 and Marc Raeff, ‘Transfiguration and Modernisation: The Paradoxes of Social Disciplining, Paedagogical Leadership, and the Enlightenment in Eighteenth-Century Russia’, in Marc Raeff, *Political Ideas and Institutions in Imperial Russia* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1994), p. 341.

80. Elise Kimerling Wirtschafter, ‘The Search for Society in Eighteenth-Century Russia’, *Study Group on Eighteenth-Century Russia Newsletter*, no. 30 (2002), pp. 24-25.

mainly peasants.⁸¹ Contemporaries also made this distinction within Russian society. As Aleksandr P. Sumarokov put it, in relation to the audience for his plays, ‘the word “Public” as Monsieur Voltaire somewhere states, does not refer to all of society, but only to a small proportion of it, namely to persons of taste and learning.’⁸²

Eighteenth-Century Russian Society

Wirtschafter’s valuable work on the porous nature of social groups in Imperial Russia has highlighted the complicated situation faced by both the State and the groups themselves in relation to their sense of identity and legal status.⁸³ Economic development, improvements in education and urban growth all had an important influence on the various groups within society, although most of these groups tended to remain negatively defined (i.e. the nobility were ‘not’ clergy, merchantry or peasantry, for traditionally-established reasons). As a result, the emergence of new groups which crossed these traditional social boundaries has been a topic of considerable debate. The emergence of the intelligentsia in the nineteenth century is a frequently-cited example, wherein the focal interest for members of this group was political, although this was a bridge to broader discussion of other socio-cultural, philosophical and ethical issues.⁸⁴ However, other areas were equally important in forming social bonds - for example, a common religious or ethnic background - and the environment of a town/city was an important setting for this process. One of the central ideas in the conception of civil society is the freedom to associate in ‘public’ (or elsewhere), hence the existence of a space between the State and the family in which culture can be consumed, thereby leading to the creation of ‘public’ culture.⁸⁵ As noted above, in relation to Goffman and Sennett’s work, the urban environment created a more open social atmosphere than rural communities and this aided the creation of ‘public’ activities involving a number of different social groups.

The definition of such groups within society has been viewed by some (i.e. pre-

81. Gleason, ‘The Terms of Russian Social History’, p. 19.

82. Preface to *The False Demetrios* (1771), quoted in Smith, *Working the Rough Stone*, pp. 59-60.

83. Elise Kimerling Wirtschafter, *Social Identity in Imperial Russia* (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1997).

84. Samuel D. Kossow, James L. West and Edith W. Clowes, ‘Introduction: The Problem of the Middle in Late Imperial Russian Society’, in Clowes, Kossow and West (ed.), *Between Tsar and People*, pp. 4-5.

85. Kossow, West and Clowes, ‘The Problem of the Middle’, p. 6.

Revolutionary and Western historians) as state-imposed and repressive, an idea which Soviet scholars developed and also extended retrospectively. However, the social groups themselves played a more active role in asserting their identity than perhaps previously credited. The *Ulozhenie* (1649) legally established the obligations and duties of the different parts of Russian society, as well as the distinctive privileges for certain groups, such as the nobility and the clergy. These privileges, in particular, were an important factor in developing a sense of identity within these groups. However, the State recognised that some degree of social mobility provided valuable incentive for diligent service and as a result, the exclusivity of certain groups was undermined to an extent.⁸⁶ The clearest examples of this can be seen in relation to the nobility, particularly during the reign of Peter I, when several of their privileges, such as the right to own serfs and even their status itself, were made accessible, albeit in a very limited manner, to other social groups. This was linked to the wider theme of utility under Peter I, wherein all members of society had to serve a 'useful' function for the benefit of the State (discussed further in Chapter Two). The nobility were forced to justify their elevated social position through service to the State, which required them to be absent from their families and estates for long periods of time.

The principle of 'compulsory' service was reinforced by the unpopular 1714 'Law on Single Inheritance'.⁸⁷ This forbade the division of an estate amongst a noble's heirs and also prevented the nobility from purchasing land until they had served in the military (preferably) or civil administration for a certain number of years.⁸⁸ Furthermore, education was established in a number of *ukazy* as a necessary requisite for service, although it was viewed in strictly pragmatic terms, as a means to provide more effective service, rather than to develop the individual. Ability and competence had already been established as important factors in military promotions, in part reflecting Peter's personal attitude, but also no doubt due to the circumstances of Russia's prolonged involvement in the Great Northern War. This was enshrined in the 'Table of Ranks', introduced in January 1722, which established a unified and

86. Freeze, 'The *Soslovie* (Estate) Paradigm', pp. 11-13 and Boris Mironov, 'Social Policies of Catherine II and their Results: Establishment of Estate Paradigm in Law and Social Consciousness', in *Russland zur Zeit Katharinas II: Absolutismus - Aufklärung - Pragmatismus*, ed. by Eckhard Hübner, Jan Kusber and Peter Nitsche (Köln: Böhlau, 1998), p. 117.

87. *PSZ*, vol. IV, no. 2789 (23 March 1714), p.

88. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 176.

rationally-based system assessing social hierarchy, with education and competent service intended to be the main determinants of a man's rank on the table.⁸⁹ It drew on the examples provided by contemporary Swedish, Prussian and Danish models, which were analysed by Andrei (Heinrich) Osterman. Further examples from England and France were also examined but were not considered appropriate for Russia.⁹⁰

The 'Table of Ranks' was an important departure from previous practise in several respects. Most notably, it established a link between state service and the attainment of noble status, specifically for all military officers and civil officials reaching Rank 8. In the latter case, they were designated 'personal' nobles - the privilege was not hereditary. It also introduced a formal division between military and civil service, and created a separate hierarchy of Court ranks, discussed further in Chapter Three. It was not, however, an attempt to introduce a meritocratic system to the Russian administration, since the main beneficiary was always intended to be the State.⁹¹ Although competition at the lower levels of the civil administration in particular meant that ability and education played some role in promotions, the explanatory points included in the *ukaz* which set out the 'Table' carried an implicit recognition of the importance of family lineage.⁹² For example;

1. Принцы, которые от нашей крови происходят, и те которые с нашими принцессами сочтаны: имеют при всяких случаях председательство и ранг над всеми князьями и высокими служители Российского государства.⁹³

Another example would be the category of 'distinguished people' (*znatnye liudi*), who were recognised as a distinct group within the nobility. They were given a separate space at important ceremonies, such as Catherine I's coronation in 1724, and were given permission to break the night-time curfew in St Petersburg, along with their servants.⁹⁴ Similarly, work on the leading members of the nobility in 1730, specifically the *Generalitet* (Ranks 1-4 of the military and civil administration), indicates that there

89. PSZ, vol. VI, no. 3890 (24th January 1722), pp. 486-93.

90. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 181.

91. James Hassell, 'Implementation of the Russian Table of Ranks during the Eighteenth Century', *Slavic Review*, vol. 29, no. 2 (1970), p. 283.

92. Raeff, 'The Well-Ordered Police State', pp. 1231-33.

93. Lebedev (ed.), *Reformy Petra I*, p. 75.

94. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, pp. 182-84.

were relatively few ‘new men’ at the highest levels of the Petrine administration and that their numbers decreased in the period following 1725.⁹⁵

Although such distinctions continued to exist, nevertheless the nobility as a whole continued to enjoy a considerable number of privileges over the rest of society. Their exemption from the Poll Tax, the right to wear a sword, to have a family coat-of-arms and to ride in a carriage were closely guarded throughout the eighteenth century. Their sense of social distinctiveness was compounded by a combination of educational, linguistic and behavioural factors, as well as the role which the State afforded them in society and in the administration.⁹⁶ The gradual relaxation of their obligations to the State during the decades after Peter’s death, reflected in abolition of the Law on Single Inheritance in 1731 and of compulsory state service in 1762, enabled them to develop into something more than the servants of the State that Peter had aimed to create. They were left with a reasonable degree of education (in many cases) and more ‘leisure’ time in which to hone their social skills by participating in and thereby shaping the new cultural forms which Russia was importing. They were increasingly encouraged to think of themselves as an ‘estate’, a process which was enshrined in the ‘Charter to the Nobility’ (1785), which did not grant any major new privileges to the nobility, but rather confirmed existing ones.⁹⁷ However, service in the state administration, although no longer compulsory, remained an important part of the Russian nobility’s experience, not least due to the social distinction associated with certain offices (*chiny*) and with the attainment of high rank (*rang*). Military service also continued to hold its established attractions for young noblemen.⁹⁸

Turning to the urban population, as noted above, Habermas saw the commercial development of the towns and the corresponding growth of the bourgeoisie as important elements in the emergence of new forms of ‘public’ interaction, which took place in forums separate from those controlled by both the Church and the State.⁹⁹ The ‘new’

95. Brenda Meehan-Waters, *Autocracy and Aristocracy: The Russian Service Elite of 1730* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1982), pp. 37-48.

96. Mironov, ‘Social Policies of Catherine II’, pp. 118-19.

97. Roger P. Bartlett, ‘Russia and the Enlightenment’, in *Structure and Tradition in Russian Society: Papers from an International Conference on the Occasion of the Seventieth Birthday of Iurii M. Lotman*, ed. by Robert Reid, Joe Andrew and Valentina Polukhina (Helsinki: Slavica Helsingiensia, 1994), pp. 5-6.

98. David M. Griffiths, ‘Eighteenth-Century Perceptions of Backwardness’, p. 328.

99. Habermas, *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, p. 17.

bourgeoisie did not consist of small traders or artisans, both groups covered by the 'old' category of *burgher*. Instead, the term came to describe a new group of administrative officials, professionals (scholars, doctors and legal specialists) and the members of the commercial community who had adapted to the new economic environment. Their shared interests led to the more open discussion of news and ideas, and the emergence of new social areas in the late seventeenth century, a process which was to develop further across Europe in the eighteenth century.¹⁰⁰ The traditional gathering places, such as the guilds and the parish fraternities, had fallen victim to the Reformation and the social changes precipitated by the new economic situation which heralded the advent of early capitalism. The development of clubs and voluntary associations in early modern towns provided new areas for expressing the sociability that emerged as part of the process described by Habermas.¹⁰¹ These bodies served to bring together the disparate elements of the urban population and could provide a means of fostering a wider sense of community. This performed a function similar to the traditional participatory (often religious) festivals and rituals which had been one of the purposes of medieval towns, but which had fallen away with the centralisation of government and the coming of the Reformation.¹⁰²

Perhaps reflecting its comparative underdevelopment in relation to Western Europe, the identity and attitudes of the early modern Russian urban population has been limited. A variety of legal privileges and obligations were established for inhabitants of towns, without necessarily defining the criteria upon which they were based, leading to considerable confusion at the time as to who could be identified as part of the urban community. The distinction between the merchantry, the urban peasantry and the rest of the town inhabitants is not easily made, since the majority of the lower levels of urban society were neither noble nor peasantry, nor were they rich enough to register with a guild as merchants.¹⁰³ The legal definition of the urban population can be found in the *Ulozhenie*, in which it is stipulated that they (*posadskie*) were to pay a poll tax and perform urban services in return for trading privileges and the status of

100. Habermas, *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, pp. 23-25.

101. Peter Clark, *Sociability and Urbanity: Clubs and Societies in the Eighteenth-Century City* (Leicester: University of Leicester, 1986), pp. 5-9.

102. Clark, *Sociability and Urbanity*, pp. 2-4.

103. Wirtschafter, *Social Identity in Imperial Russia*, p. 130.

‘townsman’. But the *Ulozhenie* did not recognise all inhabitants of the towns as legal ‘townsmen’ because the town itself was not seen as a geographical space, merely a legal-administrative unit.¹⁰⁴ Wirtschafter’s work demonstrates the actual lack of a solid distinction between, and the social ambiguity of, the urban and rural populations. For example, she highlights the large number of seasonal rural workers in towns (this category accounted for as much as a third of the total urban population in 1744), and skilled urban craftsmen in the surrounding rural settlements, both in search of additional employment.¹⁰⁵

The Petrine reforms dealing with the towns focussed on the reorganisation of the urban area to maximise tax revenue - a common problem had been the fact that many urban inhabitants would avoid registering, thereby avoiding the taxes and obligations that official *posadskie* bore.¹⁰⁶ The central problem of assessing the actual constitution of the urban population went unresolved, since the census material was either unhelpful or contradictory (it failed to recognise one of the larger urban groups, trading peasants, as part of the town population). The government had not helped in this administrative confusion by allowing peasant traders either to continue to trade illegally or to register with a guild (providing they paid the requisite fees).¹⁰⁷ Mironov argues that an urban estate emerged in Russia only in the latter half of the eighteenth century, following the conscious efforts of Catherine II to promote development in this area (discussed above) through the 1775 local government reforms and the ‘Charter to the Towns’ (1785). The legislation tried to properly define the town’s populace by establishing three categories into which the town’s inhabitants were placed; the wealthy merchants (divided into three merchant guilds), the *meshchane*, and the smaller craftsmen attached to the craft guilds. It also codified the town’s rights and obligations, prevented the other social groups (principally the nobility and the peasantry) from infringing on the trading activities of the urban population, and granted the town its own distinctive attributes, such as a coat-of-arms.¹⁰⁸

As Catherine discovered, one of the problems was that even at the end of the

104. J. Michael Hittle, *The Service City: State and Townsmen in Russia, 1600-1800* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979), pp. 66-69.

105. Wirtschafter, *Social Identity in Imperial Russia*, pp. 133-34.

106. Hittle, *The Service City*, pp. 77-81.

107. Wirtschafter, *Social Identity in Imperial Russia*, pp. 131-33.

108. Mironov, ‘Social Policies of Catherine II’, pp. 127-28.

eighteenth century many settlements officially described as ‘towns’ were little more than large villages. In the seventeenth century, only Moscow compared in size and population with major Western cities. The foundation and rapid expansion of a new capital were therefore of immense significance for the development of the urban sector, as were the new planning principles and regulating legislation that influenced St Petersburg’s subsequent development. The sense of identity amongst the city’s permanent inhabitants was also influenced by the fact that St Petersburg, as capital, housed the main State institutions and the Court, which will be discussed further in Chapter One. The regulation and planning aspects of the city also had an important influence on its inhabitants, which was reflected in the establishment of the Police Chancellery to oversee many aspects of everyday ‘public’ life and this will be discussed further in Chapter Two.

This period also saw a considerable change in the social role of women, again as a consequence of Peter’s experiences in relation to the West. For Muscovite *boyarini*, life was spent largely in the seclusion of the *terem*, with covered carriages and segregated areas in churches to maintain this sense of separation from ‘public’ view.¹⁰⁹ Although this gradually began to change in the latter half of the seventeenth century, not least in the activities of Peter’s own half-sister Sophia as regent during the 1680s, it was really only during Peter’s reign that elite ladies became truly ‘visible’ in a social and cultural sense.¹¹⁰ This was not merely by virtue of being removed from the *terem* and placed in new social settings, but also due to greater emphasis on their appearance. The adoption of foreign fashions, which will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Five, also led to a revised opinion of what constituted feminine beauty in Russia, which in turn had an important impact on music, art and literature in dealing with that subject.¹¹¹ This change in circumstances can be linked to the Petrine emphasis on service, which was expected of women just as it was of their male counterparts.

109. See Nancy S. Kollmann, ‘The Seclusion of Elite Muscovite Women,’ *Russian History*, vol. 10 (1983), pp. 170-187, and further discussion in Isolde Thyret, *Between God and Tsar: Religious Symbolism and the Royal Women of Muscovite Russia* (DeKalb, Northern Illinois University Press, 2001).

110. Lindsey Hughes, ‘Between Two Worlds: Tsarevna Natal’ia Alekseevna and the Emancipation of Petrine Women’, in *A Window on Russia: Papers from the V International Conference of the Study Group on Eighteenth-Century Russia: Gargnano, 1994*, ed. by Maria di Salvo and Lindsey Hughes (Rome: La Fenice, 1996), p. 29.

111. Volkov, ‘The Forms of Public Life’, pp. 67-68.

Consequently, elite women were given set roles at State celebrations and other festivities, like the female section to the 'All-Drinking Synod', and were punished in the same terms as their male counterparts (even in terms of alcohol forfeits) if they failed to attend or participate properly. To balance this, elite women were able to hold rank in their own right, where previously they relied on their fathers or husbands, though again this carried the same sense of obligation to the State.¹¹² However, women of all backgrounds had a clearly-defined role in eighteenth-century Russian society, based largely on the traditional Orthodox virtues, which continued to be very influential. For example, their role in raising children meant that they represented an important moral influence through the promotion of virtues. However such activities were generally conducted in the private or domestic sphere. Even the wider expression of such roles, such as their acknowledged 'civilising' influence at social gatherings, took place in controlled 'public' private spaces.¹¹³ Charity was one of the only acceptable public roles for women, and this was in part due to the perception that it was merely an extension of the maternal and virtuous role of women. It also had its origins in Orthodox concepts of 'appropriate' activities for women, and it is significant that this was one of the few 'visible' areas of elite female life in this period.¹¹⁴

Gender played an important role in shaping social expectations and behaviour. Men and women were expected to display different virtues - men were to show their duty to both society and each other, whereas women had a duty to their husbands and to their family. These gender roles were reinforced by both education and advice literature (also discussed in Chapter Five).¹¹⁵ Prior to the reign of Catherine II, education for young women had either been conducted within the family home, sometimes under the supervision of a foreign governess, or in a foreign-run school (referred to in Russian as a *pansion*), particularly during the reign of Elizabeth. The recognition of the need for appropriate female education was enshrined in the establishment of the Smol'nyi Institute for Young Ladies, under Ivan I. Betskoi in 1764. Its comparatively broad curriculum included languages and social graces, such as dancing and manners,

112. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, pp. 193-94.

113. Wendy Rosslyn, 'In and Between the Public and Private Spheres: Women and their Writing in Eighteenth- and early Nineteenth-Century Russia' (unpublished paper).

114. Adele Lindenmeyr, 'Public Life, Private Virtues: Women in Russian Charity, 1762-1914', *Signs: Journal of Women and Culture*, vol. 18, no. 31 (1993), pp. 562-91.

115. Hull, *Sexuality, State and Civil Society*, pp. 224-25.

alongside more academic subjects, with the intention of enabling women to play the role envisioned for them by Catherine II, that of moral educators.¹¹⁶ The subject of female education will be discussed further in Chapter Five.

Each of these groups was important for the subsequent discussion of a 'public'. The nobility were clearly intended to play a leading role in Peter's reformed Russian State, both as its administrators and as its Westernised social elite, and this goal was reflected in many of the regulations applied to them during his reign. Several aspects of their development, principally in relation to education, were consolidated and refined during the post-Petrine period. At the same time, they became an important part of the developing Court, discussed in Chapter Three, and the social spaces which emerged around it, discussed in Chapter Four. On a wider level, St Petersburg itself represented a space in which the nobility and the various groups which constituted urban society could interact in a general 'public' setting. The various areas that the city encompassed, such as the social spaces of the Court noted above, will be discussed further in Chapter One. During the same period, the female members of the elite were undergoing a similar process of change, having been forced to emerge from the seclusion of Muscovite society into a more 'public' social setting in a relatively short period of time. Although their role remained more limited than their male counterparts, it is important to note the recognition of a role for women in such a setting and the areas which helped to influence this role will be discussed in Chapter Five.

Composition of a 'Public' in Russia

The term 'public' has frequently been taken for granted in the historiography of the period and the exact nature of its use is usually not directly addressed. For example, the ruler may be described as appearing or dining in 'public' during Court celebrations, but the identity and size of the audience is not discussed, despite the fact that this 'public' was clearly distinct from a wider 'public', in the sense of the population. The brief discussion above of the uses of the word in eighteenth-century Russian has attempted to show that it could cover a range of meanings and a number of different social groups, each with a different degree of access and participation to the areas concerned. A number of these groups have been discussed with regard to their position within society,

116. Wendy Rosslyn, 'Making their Way into Print: Poems by Eighteenth-Century Russian Women', *Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 78, no. 3 (2000), pp. 408-9.

and their relationship with the Russian State, as well as how these both changed during this period. In this final section, I wish to look at some views on the composition of a Russian ‘public’ and then set out the areas which the thesis will cover in examining this topic, specifically in relation to St Petersburg during the period 1703-1761.

Other approaches to the concept of an early eighteenth-century Russian ‘public’ and attempts to define it have also proved fruitful. For example, in his most recent work on Russia’s cultural development during the reign of Peter I, James Cracraft examines the issue of reading public (using the term *publika*) in relation to the State’s publishing activities. He highlights the fact that Peter ordered all publications, including translated works, to be written in a style which would be accessible to a wide-ranging readership, rather than simply the well-educated clergy. Cracraft includes in this *publika*

military and naval officers and their students, diplomats, technocrats, and civil administrators, aspiring new-style courtiers both male and female, natural scientists and other purely secular scholars, artists and skilled craftsmen...¹¹⁷

He estimates that this group may have numbered up to several thousand, based loosely on the comment in the *Razsuzhdenie*, quoted at the start of this Introduction, in which Shafirov discussed this group with reference to their mastery of foreign languages. As noted above, the accuracy of the figures must be tempered by the fact that Shafirov’s was hardly an objective opinion in this regard.¹¹⁸ Similarly, such a high figure is not reflected in the sales of books and other publications in the period (discussed in Chapter Five).

However, in his work on courtly spectacle in Russia and its role as a ‘scenario of power’, discussed above, Wortman estimates an audience of between 3000-4000 people, a similar size to Cracraft’s Petrine *publika*. This was split between a ‘core’ group, consisting of the ruler, his or her family, and the top officials of the Court and the military (in other words, the *Generalitet*), and a wider group, including the officers of the Guards regiments, middle-ranking Court and administrative officials, representatives

117. Cracraft, *Petrine Revolution in Culture*, p. 299.

118. For a useful summary of Shafirov’s career and his role in the reforms introduced by Peter I, see George Munro, ‘Shafirov, Petr Pavlovich’, in *Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*, ed. by Joseph L. Wiczyński (Gulf Breeze, FL: Academic International Press, 1990), vol. 34, pp. 122-26.

of the Church hierarchy and the wealthier merchants.¹¹⁹ Although Wortman identifies this group with a slightly later period, it is important to recognise that it had its origins in the reign of Peter I with the establishment of the major Court celebrations that Wortman analyses as a regular part of the calendar (discussed in Chapter Three). This group can also be linked to John P. LeDonne's study of the Russian aristocracy as a 'ruling class' during the eighteenth century, in which he examined the role of the extensive family connections and patronage networks throughout society and government.¹²⁰ Although this is not an area which I will discuss in detail in this thesis, it is important to note that these links were another important influence on elite social life.

Another issue worthy of examination is the extent to which the forms of Russian 'public' were self-limiting. Dixon has convincingly argued that thinking of any eighteenth-century Russian 'public' in the same terms as one might consider its British, French or German contemporaries, making specific reference to Habermas's model, is not to compare equals by any means. The areas associated with these other European 'publics' were either not applicable in Russian society or were underdeveloped by comparison, as with publishing and the reading 'public' (discussed in Chapter Five). He also highlights a tension between 'public' and 'private' in Russia which did not exist in other contemporary Western European states. This can be seen in the exclusivity of certain 'public' institutions, like the St Petersburg English Club, which voluntarily imposed a limit of three hundred members, and the desire to maintain a degree of anonymity amongst authors, who adopted pseudonyms or allowed only certain circles to read their material. However, both of these can be interpreted as necessary steps in order to ensure a degree of trust and sense of common purpose amongst people who had, until comparatively recently, been unused to meeting and interacting in 'public'.¹²¹

Dixon refers to an account of St Petersburg by the German economist Heinrich von Storch from the late eighteenth century which highlighted the reluctance of some people to participate in 'public' events or frequent 'public' places. Instead they preferred the more 'private' public spaces of clubs and areas with some degree of

119. Wortman, *Scenarios of Power*, p. 8.

120. John P. LeDonne, *Absolutism and Ruling Class: The Formation of the Russian Political Order, 1700-1825* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), pp. 20-21.

121. Dixon, *Catherine the Great*, p. 101.

‘control’ and familiarity.¹²² Smith’s work on Freemasonry in Russian society during the second half of the eighteenth century discusses this concept with reference to masonic lodges, which have already been noted above in relation to Habermas and Koselleck. However, his work also examined the wider area of ‘public’ life during this period using several accounts, principally by members of the social elite, which suggest that there was a more willing participation in all manner of ‘public’ activities. A number of these can be linked to the aforementioned ‘private’ public spaces, since salons and ‘open houses’ often relied on invitations whilst clubs and lodges were restricted to members. However there were other examples of more open ‘public’ events, such as the theatre, exhibitions or lectures at the Academy of Sciences, fireworks displays for State celebrations or simply walking at certain times of the day.¹²³

My own approach to the subject of a Russian ‘public’ will draw on the above discussions and incorporate elements of the theories dealt with in the first half of the Introduction. There are two main themes in the thesis, which relate to the concept of ‘public’. Firstly there is the relationship between the State and the various groups within Russian society, who formed part of a ‘public’ in St Petersburg. This was strongly influenced by contemporary ideas on the regulation and control of all parts of society to ensure ‘good order’. This theme will be discussed in Chapter One with reference to the foundation and development of the city and its spaces. These ideas will be examined in more detail in Chapter Two, as will their specific application to everyday ‘public’ life in the city through the institution of the Police Chancellery. The Court represented another major influence on the space of St Petersburg and the lives of its inhabitants. The Court also largely determined the regulation of the various forms of social interaction in the city and the element of control can be seen clearly in the restrictions on access to certain areas for prospective participants. These events and the means to access them will be looked at in Chapter Four. The requirements for access were often related to aspects of education, such as the ability to participate properly, and appearance, in the form of suitable clothing and grooming. This resulted in the development of self-regulation amongst the social elite, which was reflected in developments in education and the

122. Heinrich Friedrich von Storch, *Gemalde von St Petersburg* (Riga: J. F. Hartknoch, 1794), 2 vols, transl. as *The Picture of Petersburg* (London: Longman and Rees, 1801), pp. 421-22.

123. Smith, *Working the Rough Stone*, pp. 57-60. My thanks to Stephen Lovell for his suggestion that urban perambulation might constitute a public use of one’s leisure time.

appearance of advice literature. These areas will be discussed in Chapter Five.

The second major theme is the role of exemplary spectacle in 'public' life. This has previously been discussed in relation to Habermas's 'representative publicness', Elias's 'civilising process' and Wortman's 'scenarios of power', with the Court and its activities as the main focus. Its development as an institution and the 'public' elements of its celebrations in the city will be dealt with in Chapter Three, along with their publication to a wider audience, which allowed the events to be explained in ideal terms. Similarly the Court provided an important example by organising a number of entertainments, such as theatre and balls, which subsequently influenced the development of social life amongst the city's population, discussed in Chapter Four. However this theme will also be dealt with in a number of the other chapters. For example, St Petersburg itself and a number of its constituent spaces, notably the Academy of Sciences, were intended to provide an example to both the inhabitants of the city and Russia as a whole. Similarly, other published materials, such as the conduct literature discussed in Chapter Four, provided examples of appropriate behaviour and other information for use in both everyday life and at social events.

Chapter One - Locating the Public¹²⁴

Peter I's decision in May 1703 to found a new city in swampy terrain on the Baltic coast, with its long winters and frequent floods, seems strange, particularly given the position of the proposed site on the edge of Russian territory and its seeming vulnerability to capture by Swedish forces.¹²⁵ However, within ten years, St Petersburg was to become the seat of both the State administration and the Russian Court, and in the course of the next fifty years it emerged as a major European city. In this chapter, I will look at the development of the city during this period, with the intention of setting out the physical and spatial context in which the various elements of public life in the city, which will form the basis of my subsequent chapters, took place. The chapter begins by looking at the relationship between St Petersburg and Moscow, and what the foundation of the former represented in the wider scheme of Petrine reforms. The next section will deal with the construction of the city and the gradual move to ensure that the main groups within Russian society moved to St Petersburg, despite the demands of the ongoing conflict with Sweden. The image of the new city played a key role in Peter's campaign to give it legitimacy, both in the eyes of his subjects and on a wider European stage. This will be discussed with reference to the cultivation of symbolic links to other imperial cities, principally Rome and Constantinople, and the cult of St Aleksandr Nevskii.

Peter consciously, and perhaps also unconsciously, attempted to control both the city's space and its inhabitants in pursuit of certain goals, and the second half of the chapter will examine how the various spaces, buildings and institutions within St Petersburg influenced both the everyday and ceremonial life of the city, which is very important to this discussion of the 'public'. Many of these areas reflect the theme of control, which will be more fully discussed in Chapter Two. This relates not only to the presence of the major organs of the State, such as the Senate and the Twelve Colleges, but also to the harnessing of nature for use by both the ruler and the State. Prominent examples of this which will be examined are the Imperial gardens, which played an

124. I have included two maps in Appendix One to help show the development of the city and the location of the various places mentioned in this chapter. They will follow the location's first mention in curly brackets in the following manner: Sts Peter and Paul fortress {1}

125. James Cracraft, *The Petrine Revolution in Russian Architecture* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1988), p. 173.

important part in the attempt of both Peter and members of his inner circle to portray the new city as a 'paradise', and the Neva river, which played a major role in both the everyday and festive life of the city. The layout of St Petersburg had an impact on both the social life of the elite, in particular the emergence of social gatherings in noble houses, and on the wider celebrations taking place within it, both State occasions and traditional festivities. Finally, the role of the Academy of Sciences in the city's life and its public activities will be discussed at the end of the chapter.

Moscow and St Petersburg

Moscow has frequently been used as the contrast to St Petersburg, both in literature and in historical scholarship.¹²⁶ It is not difficult to see why this should be the case. Moscow was essentially a mediaeval city, with its Kremlin at the centre of both the city and ceremonial Court life. It was also the centre of Russian Orthodoxy, with the cathedrals of the Kremlin and several major monasteries, both in the city and its immediate environs, playing an important part in the celebration of the major religious feasts of the Orthodox, and therefore Court, calendar. It was the seat of the tsar and most of the major Russian noble families, who owned estates and palaces in or near the city. By contrast, St Petersburg was a 'new' city, with no history or tradition, and was built on territory which was only really Russian on the strength of Peter's justifications prior to the Great Northern War. However, the conclusion that Moscow was a conservative, Orthodox 'old' capital and St Petersburg was the progressive, secular 'new' capital is overly-simplistic. For example, many of the important early developments in relation to Russian art and architecture during Peter's reign occurred in Moscow, and some of these will be discussed below. On the other hand, it was still very much a seventeenth-century city and this may have limited the scope of his plans. Granted, it is very difficult to speculate about how Peter might have ruled Russia if he had chosen to concentrate his efforts on Moscow, but given his European orientation, naval interests and palpable dislike of Muscovite tradition, it is also difficult to see how Peter could have remained in that situation.¹²⁷

126. See, for example: Vladimir N. Toporov, *Peterburgskii tekst russkoi literatury: izbrannye trudy* (St Petersburg: Iskusstvo-SPB, 2003), pp. 7-22; Sergei B. Smirnov, *Peterburg-Moskva: summa istorii* (St Petersburg: Izd. RGPU im. A. I. Gertsena, 2000), pp. 11-36.

127. Denis Shaw, 'St Petersburg and Geographies of Modernity in Eighteenth-Century Russia', in *St Petersburg, 1703-1825*, ed. by Anthony Cross (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2003), p. 12.

The physical and conceptual spaces of Moscow and St Petersburg were distinct. With its origins as a fortress, the Kremlin provided Moscow with a strongly-defined physical centre, whilst at the same time representing the enclosed space and hierarchy at the heart of Muscovite society.¹²⁸ The surrounding city emanated outwards in a series of concentric circles, beginning with the Kremlin and *Kitai-gorod*, followed by *Belyi-gorod* and then the outer *Zemlianoi-gorod*. Each of these areas of the city was distinguished by a set of walls or earthworks, which also restricted movement and access.¹²⁹ By contrast, the centre of St Petersburg was shifted several times during the first two decades of construction. Although the Sts Peter and Paul fortress {1} and Trinity Square {3} providing important early focal points for the city, the structured developments planned by foreign architects for Gorodskoi Island and subsequently Vasil'evskii Island were ultimately scrapped for reasons of expense.¹³⁰ Another major influence on the city's space was the physical presence of the Neva river and the city's other waterways, which contributed to the difficulties in planning and building the city. However, the geography of the city and the lack of a single defined centre during the Petrine period also contributed to the open nature of its space, again in contrast to Moscow, and this has been linked to Peter's dislike of enclosed areas.¹³¹ The layout of St Petersburg presupposed a different sort of 'public' and 'private' activities, discussed further below.

Given the decision to found a new city and the nature of the hardships endured by its early population (discussed below), the image of St Petersburg was of paramount concern to Peter. There can be little doubt that he was enthusiastic about his new city and often described it as a 'paradise' in his letters to contemporaries, in particular to Aleksandr Menshikov, who was governor of Ingria and later St Petersburg itself.¹³² The problem of the city's image had wider implications for Peter's credibility as tsar. The

128. Lindsey Hughes, 'The Courts of Moscow and St Petersburg, c. 1547-1725', in *The Princely Courts of Europe, 1500-1750*, ed. by John Adamson (London: Weidenfield and Nicolson, 1999), p. 302

129. For a detailed description of early modern Moscow, see Adam Olearius, *The Travels of Olearius in Seventeenth-Century Russia*, transl. by Samuel H. Baron (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1967), pp. 112-17.

130. Ol'ga G. Ageeva, "*Velichaishii i slavneishii bolee vseh gradov v svete*" - grad sviatogo Petra: *Peterburg v russkom obshchestvennom soznanii nachala XVIII veka* (St Petersburg: BLITs, 1999), p. 217.

131. Hughes, 'The Courts of Moscow and St Petersburg', p. 302.

132. Stephen L. Baehr, *The Paradise Myth in Eighteenth-Century Russia: Utopian Patterns in Early Secular Russian Literature and Culture* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991), p. 69.

obvious comparison for most people to make was with Moscow, which put St Petersburg at a serious disadvantage in terms of spiritual and historical legitimacy. If the populace came to view the tsar's new city as illegitimate or indeed unholy in some way, it could have serious repercussions on the perception of Peter himself and his suitability as ruler.¹³³ To combat this image problem, there was a strong drive to provide the new city with, on the one hand, spiritual symbolism and, on the other hand, justification of its status by establishing precedent. Feofan Prokopovich and other Petrine publicists sought to exploit the legendary link between the region and St Andrew, who had, according to legend, blessed the 'northern lands' during his travels across Europe.¹³⁴

At the same time, St Andrew was the brother of St Peter, and this not only provided a credible link to the tsar and the name of his new city, but also established an important connection to the other city of St Peter - Rome. Given Peter's Imperial ambitions and the prevalence of Classical imagery in official celebrations, it is not difficult to see why Rome was an important choice to establish the legitimacy of St Petersburg. The central position occupied by the Sts Peter and Paul fortress, and its cathedral, within the city, both in physical and ceremonial terms, and the striking resemblance between the coats-of-arms of the two cities are examples of the efforts in this direction.¹³⁵ The link between the two cities also formed part of a wider Petrine attempt to make St Petersburg, rather than Moscow, the site of the 'third Rome'.¹³⁶ Another of Rome's successors, Constantinople, provided further precedent for St Petersburg, since it had been founded by Constantine the Great as the centre of the newly-Christian capital of the Christian Byzantine Empire and successor to Rome.¹³⁷ It is also significant that St Andrew was also an important part of Constantinople's claim to legitimacy, since it was alleged (almost certainly for political motives) that he had anointed the first bishop of the area during his extensive travels. As a result, his remains

133. Shaw, 'St Petersburg and Geographies of Modernity', p. 14.

134. John L. Fennell, *A History of the Russian Church to 1448* (London and New York: Longman, 1995), p. 21.

135. Baehr, *Paradise Myth*, pp. 50-51.

136. Iurii M. Lotman and Boris A. Uspenskii, 'Echoes of the Notion "Moscow the Third Rome" in Peter the Great's Ideology', in *The Semiotics of Russian Culture*, ed. by Ann Shukman (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1984), pp. 57-58.

137. Robert E. Jones, 'Why St Petersburg?', in *Peter the Great and the West: New Perspectives*, ed. by Lindsey Hughes (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), p. 200.

were moved to the city and placed in the Church of the Holy Apostles in 357AD.¹³⁸

St Aleksandr Nevskii provided another important form of legitimisation for the new city, and was also a useful political choice for Peter, especially because of the saint's famous victory against the Swedes in the Neva area in the thirteenth century. The connection between Nevskii and the new city was strengthened when Peter moved the saint's feast day from 23 November to 30 August, to coincide with the anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Nystadt in 1721. His remains were then moved from Vladimir to the newly-built St Aleksandr Nevskii monastery {5} in 1723.¹³⁹ The ceremonial interment of the remains in the monastery's church took place the following year on 30 August, and the celebrations reflected the importance of the event for the new city. The Imperial party and other dignitaries sailed to the monastery and the ships provided a cannon salute following the ceremony, whilst the guests dined with the tsar. There were illuminations to commemorate the event, both for the Court and throughout the city, and other celebrations continued on 31 August also.¹⁴⁰ The St Aleksandr Nevskii monastery subsequently became one of the major focal points of the city's religious ceremonies.¹⁴¹ The importance of both saints for the city was reflected in the fact that both feast days (30 August for St Aleksandr Nevskii and 30 November for St Andrew) became an established and important part of the Court calendar, which saw major 'public' celebrations in St Petersburg under Peter and his successors.

Such celebrations, elements of which will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Three, were a highly-visible and therefore widely accessible part of the overall process of legitimising St Petersburg, both to its prospective inhabitants and on a wider scale, throughout Russia and across Europe. Its status as a 'new' city and, in particular, its relationship with Moscow, as the spiritual and ceremonial centre of Muscovite Russia, made this an important process. Nevertheless, St Petersburg's status as a 'new' city presented Peter with a number of possibilities which would otherwise have been limited

138. Warren T. Treadgold, *A History of the Byzantine State and Society* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997), pp. 39-40.

139. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, pp. 276-77.

140. Friedrich W. von Bergholz, 'Dnevnik kamer-iunkera Fridrikha-Vil'gel'ma Berkhgol'tsa, 1721-1725 (ch. 3 & 4)', in *Iunost' derzhavy*, ed. by Viktor Naumov (Moscow: Fond Sergeia Dubova, 2000), pp. 246-49.

141. Simon Dixon, 'Religious Ritual at the Eighteenth-Century Russian Court' (forthcoming).

by the established nature of Moscow and the society which it represented.¹⁴² These possibilities generally reflected Peter's own preferences, in terms of location, planning and architectural style. In the next section, I will examine a number of these areas with particular emphasis on his desire to create his new city in a regular and orderly manner, an important influence on the 'public' life of St Petersburg (discussed in Chapter Two).

Creating St Petersburg: A 'Regular' City?

The popular image of Peter creating his European city out of nothing, in a wilderness, was mainly poetic licence on the part of later writers, such as Vasilii Trediakovskii and Aleksandr Pushkin.¹⁴³ In fact, the area was the site of a Swedish fortress, known as 'Nienschants', the town of Nien, with a population of around 4000, and a number of smaller settlements nearby were present before the city was founded. Indeed, given the paucity of raw materials in the region, they were used to provide the stone for some of St Petersburg's first buildings.¹⁴⁴ The remote geographical location of the new city had a major effect on its populace and therefore on the development of its cultural life. It was very isolated from the rest of the empire, on the Baltic coast, where it had to endure long, dark winters and a harsh environment. For example, the marshy terrain on which the city was constructed made both disease and flooding major concerns for its inhabitants.¹⁴⁵

Denis Shaw has linked St Petersburg's remoteness to the wider context of societal change in Petrine Russia, drawing on the work of historical geographers like Robert Dodgshon. Dodgshon's theory centres on the idea that early modern societies tend toward inertia, be it in terms of their cultural attitudes or their social and political institutions.¹⁴⁶ Therefore social change will occur in areas where it is likely to encounter the least resistance, and Shaw correctly points out the significance of Peter's choice to situate a new city on the very edge of Russian territory. Efforts were made to ensure that the nobility moved to the new city and to invest St Petersburg with its own religious and

142. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, pp. 204-5 and 209.

143. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 210.

144. *Ocherki istorii Leningrada. Tom 1: Period feodalizma, 1703-1861*, ed. by M. P. Viatkin (Moscow: Akademiiia Nauk SSSR, 1955), pp. 19-21.

145. Moisei S. Kagan, *Grad Petrov v istorii russkoi kul'tury* (St Petersburg: Slaviia, 1996), pp. 15-18.

146. Robert A. Dodgshon, *Society in Time and Space: A Geographical Perspective on Change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 1-16. My thanks to Denis Shaw for this reference and a useful discussion on this point.

ceremonial significance (discussed above). Both of these endeavours can be interpreted as Peter's attempts to separate the two most conservative groups in Muscovite society, the nobility and the clergy, from their traditional centre, Moscow, and thereby undermine any possible efforts on their part to resist his wider reforms.¹⁴⁷

Another important element in this process of change was linked with St Petersburg's position by the sea and its envisioned role as a Baltic port. The only port under Russian control when Peter came to power was Arkhangel'sk in the far north, which was only of limited value, not least due to the fact that foreign merchants could only access it through the White Sea, which was a hazardous route for much of the year and was frozen during the winter months. The former Ottoman fortress of Azov, captured in the campaign of 1696, was another option and it had the advantage of an ice-free port which could be reached by the river Don. But its potential, particularly in terms of trade, was limited by the fact that the Ottoman Empire controlled the straits both of Kerch and of Constantinople, limiting access to the Black Sea and the Mediterranean respectively. There was also little interest in Europe for a renewal or extension of the 'Holy Alliance' against the Ottomans, which was suggested by Peter in the late 1690s.¹⁴⁸

Instead, the idea of founding a city at the mouth of the Neva, with its access to the Baltic Sea trade route, and the necessary campaign against the Swedes to secure the territory proved more durable. This overseas trade had another effect, linked to the issue of social change mentioned above, insofar as it brought a relatively large number of foreigners to the city. They were not confined to or concentrated in a particular section of the city, as with the Foreign Quarter (*Nemetskaia sloboda*) in Moscow. Consequently they were able to play an important role in Peter's wider socio-cultural aims, not only as specialists in a given field, like ship-building or architecture, but also simply by virtue of their interaction with the city's population.¹⁴⁹ As the city itself developed and the military situation in the Baltic stabilised, especially in the aftermath of major naval victories like Hangö in 1714, the number of foreign visitors gradually increased. The

147. Shaw, 'St Petersburg and Geographies', p. 7.

148. Jones, 'Why St Petersburg?', pp. 191-93.

149. Anatolii V. Predtechenskii, 'Naselenie i byt Peterburga', in *Peterburg Petrovskogo vremeni: ocherki*, ed. by Anatolii V. Predtechenskii (Leningrad: Lenizdat, 1948), p. 136 and Shaw, 'St Petersburg and Geographies', p. 13.

very fact that Peter himself was frequently in St Petersburg ensured that foreign diplomats were mainly concentrated there.

The hostile military circumstances in which the city was founded had an impact on the nature of the city and contributed to the city's later association with the parade-ground. Indeed, it is significant that the 'final foundation stone' of the city was only laid in the aftermath of the victory at Poltava in 1709, both physically and also in Peter's mind, as is shown by a comment to that effect in a letter to Admiral Apraksin.¹⁵⁰ The impact of this military influence on early St Petersburg could be seen in other areas. For example, everyday timekeeping was dominated by the cannon-fire from the Sts Peter and Paul fortress and the Admiralty {2} to mark regular intervals throughout the working day.¹⁵¹ Similarly, a series of civil regulations (*reglamenti*) were issued during Peter's reign, which covered the administrative duties and procedures of many of the major State institutions, such as the Colleges and the Senate. These owed much to the model of the first of Peter's published regulations, the Military Statute (*Voennyi Ustav*) of 1716, which provided precise instructions for officers.¹⁵² These regulations will be discussed further in Chapter Two.

The desire for regulation and 'good order' was not only related to the military situation, but also reflected a wider European emphasis on these themes in urban planning, which Peter had observed on the Grand Embassy, particularly during his visit to Amsterdam. There were a number of areas in common between the features stressed in military design and those considered important in a 'regular' early modern city.¹⁵³ In this respect, it is important to note the inclusion of features like broad, straight streets in a regular pattern and an integrated canal system to aid transport and communications in a list of points written by Peter which had to be included in any prospective plan for the construction of St Petersburg.¹⁵⁴ These were reflected in the plan submitted by the French architect Jean LeBlond in 1716. It was based largely on developing Vasil'evskii island, thus reflecting another of Peter's initial ideas for the centre of his new city, with

150. Cracraft, *Petrine Revolution in Russian Architecture*, p. 179.

151. Irina Chudinova, 'The Audio-Spatial Aspect of St Petersburg in the Eighteenth Century', *Kul'turologiia - Petersburg Journal of Cultural Studies*, vol. 2 (1994), p. 43.

152. Ageeva, "*Velichaishii i slavnoishii bolee vsekh gradov v svete*", pp. 250-52.

153. Simon Werrett, 'An Odd Sort of Display: The St Petersburg Academy of Sciences in Enlightened Russia', unpublished Ph.D. thesis (University of Cambridge: King's College, 2000), p. 21.

154. Sergei P. Luppov, *Istoriia stroitel'stva Peterburga* (Moscow: Nauka, 1957), pp. 23-24.

a geometric pattern of streets and canals, surrounded by extensive fortifications in the contemporary French 'Vauban' style. As noted above, the geographical situation of the city and the enormous expense that such a plan would have incurred, especially since construction work in the city was already well underway by the time Le Blond arrived, made it impossible to adopt. Nevertheless some elements were retained, as shown by the canal/street grid which developed on Vasil'evskii Island.¹⁵⁵

Peter's efforts to move all of the major organs of government to St Petersburg, as with the relocation of the Senate to the city in late 1713, and the fact that he referred to his new city as the 'capital' (*stolitsa*) as early as 1704 were important factors in the shaping of the city's space and its cultural life.¹⁵⁶ For example, both were factors that affected the status of the city and its inhabitants. Its role as capital also ensured that the city was the venue for many important celebrations and other cultural innovations. This, in turn, had a corresponding effect on the actual appearance of the city, both in terms of its architecture and its space, which I will examine below.¹⁵⁷ Most of the city's major building projects had foreign architects and the European-style planning of the city, together with the geographical features of the area it was founded in, gave it a very different feel from other Russian cities. However, it is very important to note that several of the innovations associated with European architecture and planning had already emerged in Moscow. For example, Fedor Golovin's palace and its gardens (completed in 1702) were in the European style, and Mikhail Gagarin's mansion on Tverskaia ulitsa (finished in 1707) was modelled on an Italian villa. Similarly, a number of *ukazy* which were intended to introduce order and regularity to Moscow's appearance pre-empted similar decrees later issued in St Petersburg. In 1699, house owners were instructed to keep the area in front of their houses clean. In 1704, owners of property near the Kremlin and *Kitai-gorod* were ordered to build houses along the main and side streets to create a regular street front, rather than in the middle of their property.¹⁵⁸

In order to co-ordinate the various elements in the construction of St Petersburg,

155. James H. Bater, *St Petersburg: Industrialisation and Change* (London: Edward Arnold, 1976), pp. 21-22 and Iurii A. Egorov, *The Architectural Planning of St. Petersburg*, trans. by Eric Dluhosch (Athens, GA: Ohio University Press, 1969), p. 12.

156. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 211.

157. Elena E. Keller, *Prazdnichnaia kul'tura Petersburga: ocherki istorii* (St Petersburg: Izd. V. A. Mikhailova, 2001), p. 40 and Kagan, *Grad Petrov*, p. 17.

158. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, pp. 204-5.

Peter I established the Chancellery of Urban Affairs in 1706, renamed the Chancellery of Construction in 1723, under the direction of Ul'ian A. Seniavin, with the Italian Domenico Trezzini as its chief architect.¹⁵⁹ The Chancellery was responsible not only for city planning and building designs, through its architects, but also managing the wider work force and building materials. As a result, it had a very large budget, by civilian standards, of around 5% of State revenue by the early 1720s.¹⁶⁰ Their activities with regard to the intended regular appearance of the new city were directed by a number of *ukazy* issued by Peter. For example, house plans were commissioned from Trezzini for groups such as 'common' (*podlye*) and 'notable' (*imenitye*) people and, from April 1714 onwards, these were used as the basis for orders on the type of houses that should be built by different groups in society and what sort of materials they should use. There was also an attempt to legislate on where in the city they should be located, depending on the role of their inhabitants within society. For example, in the *ukaz* of May 1712, noted by Whitworth and discussed above, it was stipulated that the nobility should build their houses along the Neva upriver from Peter's Winter Palace {4}, whilst the merchants and artisans were to build their houses on the opposite bank, on Vasil'evskii island.¹⁶¹

However, in both cases, such laws proved difficult to enforce. Trezzini's house plans were only for those who could afford to build such houses and only really applied to the façades of buildings in highly-visible parts of the city, such as the banks of the main waterways. The *ukaz* on the location of houses was reissued in March 1720, but it continued to prove very difficult to make people move to certain parts of the city, notably Vasil'evskii island.¹⁶² The relative neglect of this part of the city was noted by foreign visitors. For example, after a visit to Vasil'evskii island in March 1725, Bergholz described the considerable number of stone houses standing empty, since their noble owners had residences elsewhere in the city.¹⁶³ Sir Francis Dashwood also noted these fine but empty houses in 1733, as well as the fact that, although the island was

159. Luppov, *Istoriia stroitel'stva Peterburga*, pp. 62-66 and Cracraft, *Petrine Revolution in Russian Architecture*, p. 175.

160. Cracraft, *Petrine Revolution in Russian Architecture*, p. 175, fn. 77.

161. 'Diplomaticheskaiia perepiska angliiskikh poslov i poslannikov pri russkom dvore (1711-1719)', ed. by A. A. Polovtsov, *SIRIO*, vol. 61 (St Petersburg, 1888), pp. 205-6.

162. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, pp. 215-17.

163. Bergholz, 'Dnevnik', *Iunost' derzhavy*, p. 272.

supposedly the commercial centre of the city, many merchants did not live there. He believed that this was linked to the construction of a pontoon bridge (discussed below), which allowed them to travel easily from the Admiralty side to the island to conduct their business at the Exchange.¹⁶⁴

The speed with which the city sprang up made the implementation of many of Peter's requirements haphazard at best, especially in terms of the number of wooden residences in the areas away from the main façades. In the aftermath of major fires around the Admiralty in the mid 1730s, which cleared much of this housing, the 'Commission for Orderly Development of St. Petersburg' was established (in 1737) to regulate construction of housing, streets and squares so as to ensure a more unified appearance of the city and the three-prong street pattern emanating from the Admiralty (a Petrine idea) began to materialise.¹⁶⁵ In particular this period saw the consolidation of Nevskii prospekt {15} (as it became known from 1738 onwards) as the main arterial route in the city, excepting the Neva, and as a result it was used for major celebrations, which will be discussed below in relation to the city's festive space. Both members of the Court and the wider nobility hired foreign architects to build palaces and other structures. This meant that, although a unified appearance was not possible with the mixture of architectural styles throughout the city, the 'public' aspects of the city's overall appearance improved considerably. These changes also affected the lives of the city's inhabitants and the experiences of St Petersburg early population will be examined in the next section.

Populating St Petersburg

The population of the new city was also subject to official regulation and was conducted in a manner similar to conscription. Building work was initially begun by troops and local inhabitants, but the numbers were insufficient for both Peter's plans and patience. Beginning with 40,000 workers mentioned in an *ukaz* of March 1704, tens of thousands of workers were sent to work on the new city, and a pattern of two annual 'shifts' of three months (between April and October) was established in 1705. Although the number of workers was increased in 1707, the demands of the war against Sweden and

164. Dashwood, 'Diary of his Visit', pp. 202 and 206.

165. Bate, *St Petersburg*, pp. 27-28.

the high rate of desertion, despite the use of armed guards to escort the workers to the site, meant that the required workforce was always lower than that stipulated.¹⁶⁶ For example, the Senate reported the high rate of desertion to the tsar in December 1712.¹⁶⁷ Given the miserable working and living conditions, linked to the relatively high mortality rates amongst the work force (discussed below), the considerable distance from their homes, and the nature of the conscription itself, it is hardly surprising that this was the case.

However, amongst other contemporaries, the city acquired a reputation distinctly at odds with any comparison to the 'Eden' on the Baltic coast that Peter wished to make. It was more often seen as a city built on bones, due to the large number of workers who were believed to have died during the construction process due to the poor working conditions, a view which featured strongly in foreign accounts of the city.¹⁶⁸ The work of the authoritative historian of early St Petersburg, Sergei Luppov, indicates that the numbers given by foreigners were undoubtedly exaggerated.¹⁶⁹ The exact number of deaths caused by disease and squalid working conditions have been somewhat difficult to establish, not least due to the lack of accurate information.¹⁷⁰ However, an excessively high death rate seems unlikely given that the city had only a small resident population during the early years - around 8000 in 1710 - which was bolstered by the biannual influx of workers, and the fact that the number of inhabitants rose rapidly to approximately 40,000 by 1725.¹⁷¹ Nevertheless, this was the impression that struck foreign observers and also made the transition into peasant songs and stories, indicating that the image of the city created was more important than the reality of the

166. Petr N. Petrov, *Istoriia Sankt-Peterburga s osnovaniia goroda do vvedeniia v deistvie vybornogo gorodskogo upravleniia po uchrezhdeniiam o guberniiakh: 1703-1782* (Moscow: Tsentrpoligraf, 2004), pp. 57-61.

167. Predtechenskii, 'Naselenie i byt Peterburga', p. 129.

168. For the various accounts of foreign visitors to St Petersburg during Peter I's reign and the number of deaths they give for the city's construction, see the excellent discussion in a footnote to the Russian translation of Sir Francis Dashwood's diary in *Peterburg Anny Ioannovny v inostrannykh opisaniakh*, ed. by Iurii N. Bespiatykh (St Petersburg: BLITs, 1997), pp. 73-74. By the time of Dashwood's visit, in 1733, the estimated figure had risen to 300,000 deaths (!): Dashwood, 'Diary of his Visit', p. 203.

169. Luppov, *Istoriia stroitel'stva Peterburga*, p. 94.

170. For a detailed discussion of the subject, using both contemporary documents and previous historical analyses of the figures, see Ageeva, *Grad sviatogo Petra*, pp. 78-81 and Evgenii V. Anisimov, *Iunyi grad* (St Petersburg: Izd. Dmitriia Bulanina, 2003), pp. 105-11.

171. Luppov, *Istoriia stroitel'stva Peterburga*, p. 23.

situation.

In addition to these conscripted workers, both the nobility and the merchantry were expected to populate Peter's new city and serve their new 'useful' functions there. For example, Charles Whitworth noted an *ukaz* in late May 1712 ordering 1000 of the 'best' noble families, a similar number of merchants and 2000 artisans to build houses in St Petersburg.¹⁷² This was followed by another *ukaz* in 1714, again ordering 1000 of the wealthiest noble families to move from Moscow to St Petersburg and build houses in the city.¹⁷³ Peter's long-term planning for the move to St Petersburg was reflected in the submission to the Senate in August 1712 of a list of 1212 members of the military and civil elite, which included all those who were to move to St Petersburg after the Great Northern War had finished. Plans were moved forward in the later stages of the war, and from 1719, several State institutions were made responsible for the transfer of the different social groups: the Senate for the nobility, the Commerce College for merchants, and the Manufacturing College for artisans.¹⁷⁴ Peter allowed for very few exceptions to these orders, although heavily pregnant women and the very ill were allowed to delay (but not avoid) their departure. A further *ukaz* stated that nobles who had failed to move to St Petersburg by 1725 would have their property demolished and then be forced to live in huts (*chernye izby*) on Vasil'evskii island. However, the fact that the *ukazy* ordering moves to the new city were reissued up until Peter's death and the Senate received a steady stream of noble petitions requesting leave to return to their estates indicates that the move to St Petersburg continued to meet with resistance.¹⁷⁵

There were good reasons for this reluctance on the part of the prospective inhabitants of the new city. Leaving aside the hardships involved in the move itself and the challenges posed by the different climate of the Petersburg region, there were serious financial implications attached to this relocation. In addition to the transport of a household to St Petersburg, the expense of constructing a new house and the higher cost of living in the new city could challenge even the more wealthy members of the elite. For example, Friedrich Christian Weber, a Hanoverian member of the English embassy

172. 'Diplomaticheskaiia perepiska angliiskikh poslov... (1711-1719)', pp. 205-6.

173. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 215 and Predtechenskii, 'Naselenie i byt Peterburga', p. 135.

174. Predtechenskii, 'Naselenie i byt Peterburga', pp. 135-36.

175. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, pp. 175 and 179.

in the city between 1714-19, wrote that some noble families believed that they had lost almost two-thirds of their capital in the move.¹⁷⁶ There was also the fact that the geographical location of the city in all likelihood made it much further from the majority of noble estates than Moscow, which again had an impact on the income and produce generated for use by the nobility.

Francis Dashwood, writing in the early 1730s, noted the example of Prince Fedor Lopukhin, who had an annual income of 30,000 rubles from his Siberian estates but could use less than half of that in St Petersburg.¹⁷⁷ The other part of Lopukhin's income doubtless included some form of payment 'in kind', in the form of foodstuffs, fuel and other goods. Whilst a noble was resident in Moscow, it was relatively straightforward to send such goods from an estate, and thereby keep costs down, but the relocation to St Petersburg made the nobility more reliant on cash income.¹⁷⁸ There seems to have been some official recognition of this by 1719, when nobles owning fewer than 100 serf households were excused from the compulsory move and current residents were allowed to apply for up to five months 'leave' to visit their estates.¹⁷⁹ Nevertheless, the presence of both the Court and the main bodies of the State administration underlined the importance of St Petersburg as a location for the nobility, despite the considerable resentment at the expense and discomfort it incurred.

Influences on St Petersburg's Space

- Nature and its Uses

Peter took steps to address the issue of St Petersburg's location, taking account of its geographical features and altering the desolate landscape of the nascent city. One of the enduring legacies of this was the Imperial gardens. As early as March 1704, Peter wrote to Tikhon Streshnev asking him to send various bushes, trees and plants in order to establish gardens in his new city, which were located on the southern bank of the Neva, opposite Trinity Square.¹⁸⁰ Over the next decade, Peter continued to collect plants for

176. Friedrich Christian Weber, *The Present State of Russia* (London: Frank Cass, 1968), vol. 1, p. 191.

177. Sir Francis Dashwood, 'Sir Francis Dashwood's Diary of his Visit to St Petersburg in 1733', ed. by Betty Kemp, *Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 38 (1959), p. 205.

178. Robert E. Jones, 'Getting the Goods to St. Petersburg: Water Transport from the Interior, 1703-1811', *Slavic Review*, vol. 43 (1984), pp. 413-17.

179. Predtechenskii, 'Naselenie i byt Peterburga', p. 136.

180. Lidiia N. Semenova, *Byt i naselenie Sankt-Peterburga (XVIII vek)* (St Petersburg: BLITs, 1998), pp. 143-44.

the gardens from the warmer areas of the empire and also imported more exotic specimens from abroad, along with gardeners to ensure their survival in the harsh climate. In particular, Dutch gardeners, such as Jan Roosen in 1712, had an important influence on the early development of the gardens. However, in 1716, Peter decided to create a regular garden in the French style and chose a design proposed by the architect LeBlond. His plan for the gardens consisted of a central alley running from the Neva, parallel to the ‘Swan’ canal (which separated the garden from Tsaritsyn Meadow{6}), which was lined with Classical busts and statues. The rest of the gardens were arranged symmetrically on either side of the alley, featuring fountains, pavilions and a wide variety of plants and trees.¹⁸¹

The *Poperechnyi* canal divided the gardens into two, although they were linked by a small bridge. From this canal to the Neva was the ‘first’ Summer Garden{7}, as begun by Ivan Matveev in 1707, which contained Peter’s stone Summer Palace and the ‘grotto’, a common feature in contemporary European gardens.¹⁸² This was often used to host the Court’s outdoor celebrations, discussed below. The other half, from the canal to the Moika, was developed after 1716 as the ‘second’ Summer Garden{8} (also known as the *Krasnyi* Garden). The ‘third’ Summer Garden{9}, also known as *Tsaritsyn* Garden due to its origins as a gift from Peter to Catherine, lay on the other side of the Moika and was connected to the main Summer Gardens by a covered footbridge. This was the site of Elizabeth’s larger wooden Summer Palace, designed and built by Rastrelli in 1742, and the gardens were subsequently extended in 1747. The final major Imperial garden lay on the other side of the Fontanka and was known as the ‘Italian’ Garden, due to the small palace built for Anna Petrovna in the Italian style.¹⁸³

These gardens played two important roles in the wider context of the city. Firstly, they were part of the wider theme of regulation and control within the city’s spaces, since the regular design represented control of nature. This endeavour was continued in the area surrounding St Petersburg, with Peter involved in both planning and creating the estates at Petergof, Ekateringof and Strel’na. In an *ukaz* of June 1723, he also

181. Anisimov, *Iunyi grad*, p. 242.

182. For details on the design and construction of the grotto, see T. B. Dubiago, *Russkie reguliarnye sady i parki* (Leningrad: Gos. izd. literatury po stroitel'stvu, arkhitekture i stroit. materialam, 1963), p. 71.

183. Semenova, *Byt i naselenie*, pp. 145-47.

ordered the nobility to follow his example by building estates around the edges of the city.¹⁸⁴ This theme was also reflected in the depictions of St Petersburg itself, which will be discussed at the end of this chapter. Secondly, the gardens were used by the Court to host a number of social events and other celebrations, even if the fickle nature of the weather occasionally dampened the tone of proceedings.¹⁸⁵ Given that strolling was already an established part of ‘public’ life elsewhere in Europe, such events introduced a space in which this was possible, albeit only for a select elite. However, later in this period, access to these gardens was granted to a wider ‘public’ and this will be examined in Chapter Four.

Another major geographical feature of St Petersburg was the Neva river. In addition to the significance of the river’s depiction and its symbolic qualities, which will be discussed below, the Neva’s impact on the space of St Petersburg and the lives of its inhabitants was linked to its sheer physical presence at the heart of the city. Unlike the narrower Moskva river, which ran through Moscow, the width of the Neva and the fact that it flowed directly into the Baltic Sea made it very difficult to bridge. The inclement climate also made crossing the river a dangerous prospect during the spring and autumn months. The situation was further complicated by Peter’s desire for the inhabitants of his new city to become capable, not to say enthusiastic sailors. This was expected of military officers and other service personnel - a system of fines was devised to ensure that they did not row in good sailing weather.¹⁸⁶ However Peter was keen to ensure that the rest of the city’s population took to the waters as well. For example, an *ukaz* in April 1718 provided boats for people of ‘various ranks’ and it was expected that they would be sailed every Sunday. There were punishments for those who missed these outings more than twice in one month.¹⁸⁷

Peter’s active stance against the construction of bridges in the city was another means of ‘encouraging’ the use of boats amongst the populace. As a result, the only bridge in St Petersburg built during his reign was the wooden footbridge linking Sts

184. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 218.

185. See, for example, Friedrich W. von Bergholz, ‘Dnevnik kamer-iunkera Fridrikha-Vil’gel’ma Berkhgol’tsa, 1721-1725 (ch. 1 & 2)’, in *Neistovyi reformator*, ed. by Viktor Naumov and A. Liberman (Moscow: Fond Sergeia Dubova, 2000), pp. 135-42.

186. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 265.

187. Predtechenskii, ‘Naselenie i byt Peterburga’, p. 150.

Peter and Paul fortress to the Petersburg side of the city.¹⁸⁸ The first to span the Neva was a pontoon bridge{19}, built in 1727 and renovated in 1734, which ran between the Church of the Resurrection of Christ, on Vasil'evskii island, and the Admiralty church.¹⁸⁹ Despite the appearance of bridges, the river remained a major transport route throughout this period. For example, Sir Francis Dashwood noted that the state monopolised the hire of 'boat ferries' and that the city's merchants tended to own their own boats, in part due to their need to negotiate the various waterways to reach the Exchange on Vasil'evskii island. Interestingly, he added that 'publick houses', by which he presumably meant *traktiry* or *avsterii* (in other words, hostelrys), also had their own vessels.¹⁹⁰ Although Dashwood does not provide a reason for this, it nevertheless indicates the integral role of water transport in the everyday life of St Petersburg.

The river Neva was used by Peter as a central part of many celebrations, again reflecting his enthusiasm for sailing. For example, the celebrations surrounding the victory at Hangö in September 1714 began with a procession of ships into St Petersburg, greeted by cannon salutes from both fortresses, followed by a parade (in carriages) with Swedish prisoners of war through a specially-constructed triumphal arch{10} to the Senate building, where Peter was promoted to vice-admiral. Celebrations culminated with a banquet in Aleksandr Menshikov's palace{11}, during which there was a display of fireworks.¹⁹¹ The naval theme was even present in several of Peter's land-based celebrations. For example, as part of the ongoing celebrations for the Peace of Nystadt, there was a carnival parade in St Petersburg in February 1722 which featured floats in the form of ships. On several other occasions, Peter or members of his close circle attended Court masquerades in naval costume.¹⁹²

In order to take part in Peter's water-based celebrations, most notably the 'naval assemblies' (*vodiannye assamblei*), members of the elite were expected to have their own vessels, including a yacht and two launches. Failure to attend these maritime events was punished in typically Petrine terms. For example, after a particularly poor showing

188. Mikhail S. Bunin, *Mosty Leningrada: ocherki istorii i arkhitektury mostov Peterburga - Petrograda - Leningrada* (Leningrad: Stroizdat, 1986), p. 10.

189. Andrei I. Bogdanov, *Opisanie Sanktpeterburga, 1749-1751* (St Petersburg: StPb filial Arkhiva RAN, 1997), p. 259 and Bunin, *Mosty*, p. 11.

190. Dashwood, 'Diary of his Visit', p. 203. These establishments will be discussed in Chapter Three.

191. Predtechenskii, 'Naselenie i byt Peterburga', p. 152.

192. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 255.

at an event to celebrate Peter's return to the city on 30 July 1723, Peter instructed the city's *politseimeister* Anton M. Devier to collect fines of fifty roubles from future absentees without sufficient excuse.¹⁹³ Even after his death, the river played a part in his funeral ceremony (discussed in more detail in Chapter Three), when a *prospekt* was marked out on the frozen river to allow the procession to travel from the Winter Palace to the Sts Peter and Paul Cathedral. Both Anna Ivanovna and Elizabeth were much less personally involved in navigational matters than Peter. They did not themselves build ships or initiate impromptu 'maritime assemblies', but they regularly used the river for both informal and ceremonial transport.

- A New Social Environment

The Winter and Summer Palaces provided important focal points for the Court in St Petersburg, although their Petrine incarnations were modest in comparison with their successors. Between 1711 and 1762, there were five incarnations of the Winter Palace. Four of them were stone buildings on the site of the current Winter Palace on the Neva, beginning with the small Petrine palace{4} in 1711, which was rebuilt and extended under both Catherine I and Anna Ivanovna, incorporating the nearby Apraksin Palace between 1732-35{16}. The other Winter Palace was a temporary wooden structure built on the Moika river for the empress Elizabeth between February and November 1755 by Bartolomeo Rastrelli during the reconstruction of the stone Winter Palace.¹⁹⁴ The Petrine Summer Palace{7}, located in the Summer Gardens on the banks of the Fontanka, was built in 1712 and continued to be used throughout this period. However, a second Summer Palace{9}, a much larger building, was built by Rastrelli, initially for Anna Leopoldovna and subsequently for Elizabeth, between 1741-43 at the other end of the gardens, where the Moika met the Fontanka.¹⁹⁵

In addition to the individual tastes of the rulers in question, another reason for the number of renovations of the Imperial palaces was the related desire to reflect the grandeur of the Russian Court and the increase in its social activities, which will be discussed in Chapters Three and Four. Whilst Peter had made use of Menshikov's

193. A subsequent report from 1 September indicates that fines were collected from Admiral Apraksin, Iakov Bruce and Cornelius Cruys: 'Ukazy, pis'ma, bumagi i rezoliutsii imperatora Petra I', ed. by Afanasii F. Bychkov, *SIRIO*, vol. 11 (St Petersburg, 1873), pp. 519-21.

194. Petr N. Stolpianskii, *Peterburg: kak voznik, osnovalsia i ros Sankt-Piterburkh* (St Petersburg: Nauchno-izdatel'skii tsentr NeGA, 1995), pp. 173-74.

195. Semenova, *Byt i naselenie*, pp. 141-42.

palace to host major celebrations, such as the wedding of Anna Ivanovna to the Duke of Courland in 1710, the development of the Court as an institution and its associated social events, such as balls, masquerades and the theatre, required the Imperial palaces to provide a grander setting. These events and other social spaces within the city were also affected by the close proximity of the Imperial palaces and the houses of the nobility, which was an area of St Petersburg's development which had no precedent in Moscow.¹⁹⁶ The nobility had not been accustomed to opening their homes to large numbers of guests and even the process of visiting was conducted in a formal manner in Muscovite Russia.¹⁹⁷

However, the introduction of new social gatherings from 1699 onwards changed this situation and the developments were embodied in the *ukaz* on *assamblei*, issued on 26 November 1718, although it was probably a confirmation of existing Petrine practice.¹⁹⁸ The *ukaz* was said to be the result of Peter's second trip to the West in 1717, observing social practices at other European courts, and the foreign influence was highlighted in the text itself, when it was noted that the French term *assambleia* was used because there was no Russian equivalent.¹⁹⁹ It is probably no coincidence that the first was held in the house of the Prince-Pope Petr Buturlin, an appropriately laid-back host for such a social evening, in St Petersburg on the day following the issuing of the *ukaz*.²⁰⁰ In general, the *assamblei* were to be held two or three times a week, as an informal gathering in a noble's house at which both men and women of various social backgrounds (Peter was careful to include master shipwrights and prominent merchants) could talk amongst themselves, play games, dance and generally interact together, regardless of the usual social barriers.²⁰¹ As noted above, dancing was an integral part of these gatherings and the informality of the occasion was highlighted by the fact that a gentleman could ask any lady (including the empress) to dance. The *ukaz* had been

196. Ageeva, "*Velichaishii i slavneishii bolee vseh gradov v svete*", pp. 230-31.

197. For example, the *Domostroi* contains advice for both receiving and being a guest: Carolyn Pouncy, *The 'Domostroi': Rules for Russian Households in the time of Ivan the Terrible* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994), pp. 84-85, 132-33 and 138-39.

198. Ol'ga G. Ageeva, 'Assamblei petrovskogo vremeni v russkoi dorevoliutsionnoi istoriografii', in *Istoriograficheskie i istoricheskie problemy russkoi kultury: sbornik statei*, ed. by Lev N. Pushkarev et al. (Moscow: Akademiia Nauk SSSR, 1983), pp. 47-48.

199. On the origins of the term, see Cracraft, *Petrine Revolution in Russian Culture*, p. 433.

200. Lidija N. Semenova, *Ocherki byta i kul'turnoi zhizni Rossii: pervaiia polovina XVIII v.* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1982), p. 200.

201. *PSZ*, vol. V, no. 3241 (26th November 1718), pp. 597-98.

signed by Anton Devier, as police-master of St Petersburg, and the element of control was still present at even these supposedly informal events. All prospective houses were carefully checked beforehand, to ensure that they met the appropriate criteria, and, as with several Petrine social occasions, participants were ‘encouraged’ not to leave by armed guards.²⁰²

Nevertheless this was a considerable step forward in the Russian context, since the *assamblei* effectively represent an attempt to extend ‘public’ social life into the previously ‘private’ space of the home. They were more accessible than previous social gatherings, by virtue of their location in the houses of prominent nobles, as opposed to the main Imperial palaces, and the explicit inclusion of a number of non-noble social groups. They also provided a forum for the consolidation of European social practices, encapsulated in elements like conversations and the various forms of entertainment, like dancing and parlour games. These social activities and particularly the presence of women also meant that the *assamblei* contributed to the development of new behavioural values amongst their participants, an element which will be discussed below in Chapter Five. Although the process of change within Russian social life continued after Peter’s death, attendance at such events was narrowed to exclude all but members of the nobility, in particular the Court elite. On 11 January 1727, Catherine I issued an *ukaz* which replaced the *assamblei* with regular evening receptions at Court, referred to as *kurdakhi*. The inspiration for these occasions may have come from her visits to Western Courts in Germany and France with Peter, given that the term has its origins in the Franco-German hybrid ‘courtag’.²⁰³

There were a number of important differences between the *assamblei* and the *kurdakhi* in two important ways: firstly, they took place only in the Imperial residence, and secondly, they were held on a fixed day (Thursday) of every week.²⁰⁴ Anna Ivanovna had held two weekly Court evenings whilst in Mitau, on Sundays and Wednesdays, according to Bergholz in September 1724.²⁰⁵ Lady Rondeau, the wife of the British resident in the 1730s, noted that she continued this practice as empress. In

202. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, pp. 268-69.

203. *Etimologicheskii slovar' russkogo iazyka*, comp. by Max Vasmer, ed. by Boris A. Larin and transl. by Oleg N. Trubachev (Moscow: Progress, 1986), vol. 2, p. 429.

204. Viktor I. Buganov, ‘Ekaterina I’, *Voprosy istorii*, no. 11 (1994), p. 48.

205. Bergholz, ‘Dnevnik’, *Iunost' derzhavy*, p. 251.

her *Letters*, she provides a brief description of their informal atmosphere, with the assembled Court playing cards and socialising ‘freely’, although she stressed that Anna kept her dignity at all times.²⁰⁶ Karl Berch, a contemporary Swedish visitor to St Petersburg, noted how the relatively open *assamblei* had fallen into disuse following Peter’s death and how this type of socialising continued only amongst the foreign ministers. The contrast was provided by the more regular ‘courtags’ which took place behind closed doors.²⁰⁷

Although there was undoubtedly an element of compulsion in the creation of and participation in the new social spaces in St Petersburg, they played an important part in changing elite social life and the various forms of interaction within it. The fact that they were initially open to other social groups is also important, since it represents an attempt to create a wider sociable group within urban society. The fact that this was subsequently restricted was due in no small part to the increasing dominance of the Court in the city’s social life. However by the latter stages of this period, such events would again be made accessible to a wider ‘public’, which will be examined in Chapter Four. However, access to such events also required a number of skills which were necessary for participation and these will be examined in Chapter Five.

- Festive and Religious Activities

As well as the activities of the Court and the social elite, the regular design of the city and its status as capital of the Empire had a corresponding effect on the popular festivities that took place within it. Indeed it has been suggested that such factors contradicted the traditionally spontaneous nature of these events.²⁰⁸ The geography of the city also served to influence its festivities, regardless of their intended nature. For example, as discussed above, the river Neva was an integral part of the city’s everyday life and therefore was considered as important as the traditional site of popular festivities, the main squares of the city, in terms of a location for celebrations. Indeed, as noted above, some of the city’s festivities, such as Peter’s ‘naval assemblies’, specifically took advantage of the river. Another key difference with regard to St

206. John T. Alexander, ‘Amazon Autocratrixes: Images of Female Rule in the Eighteenth Century’, in *Gender and Sexuality in Russian Civilisation*, ed. by Peter Barta (London: Routledge, 2001), p. 46.

207. Karl Reinhold Berch, ‘Putevye zametki o Rossii’, in Bespiatykh (ed.), *Peterburg Anny Ioannovny*, p. 166.

208. Keller, *Prazdnichnaia kul'tura Peterburga*, pp. 37-40.

Petersburg's geography was that festival spaces tended to be geographically isolated, taking place in a space, although not remote by any means (i.e. the main square of a town), which was considered separate from the everyday function of the area. However, in St Petersburg, the spaces used for festivities, such as the main squares (including Tsaritsyn meadow within this category) and the arterial routes (principally the Neva and Nevskii prospekt), dominated the centre of the city. Therefore, it could be said that the everyday and festive spaces of St Petersburg became inter-linked.²⁰⁹

There are a number of elements which contributed to the creation of a festive space, and St Petersburg must be examined in relation to each of these elements in any discussion of its space and consequently its public. The architecture of the city has already been discussed in relation to its intended role as an ideal, regulated, early modern city, but such architecture also had an impact on its ceremonial and festive life. Keller refers to St Petersburg's streets, buildings and embankments as 'an original ballroom costume' in her examination of the city's festive life, since they provided a splendid background for the city's numerous celebrations.²¹⁰ The 'regularity' of the buildings, and therefore the spaces between them, cannot fail to have had an influence on events occurring within them, whether they were State celebrations or traditional festivities.²¹¹ However, what should also be noted is that, as well as this overlap between everyday and festive spaces, events played an important part in shaping the spaces in which they occurred. Triumphal arches provide one example of this, since they were built to commemorate a victory and were used as part of said victory celebrations, but could also remain part of the city's architecture, as with the two triumphal arches on Nevskii prospekt by the mid-eighteenth century. They also served as a permanent reminder of the State's achievements.²¹² Similarly, the experience of the Neva in the everyday lives of the city's inhabitants was not the same as when it was illuminated during a firework display for a State celebration or when it was the site of popular festivities whilst frozen during the winter months.

Other elements typically used to differentiate official and popular celebrations

209. Keller, *Prazdnichnaia kul'tura Peterburga*, pp. 44-46.

210. Keller, *Prazdnichnaia kul'tura Peterburga*, pp. 41 and 51-52.

211. Kaganov, *Images of Space*, pp. 26-27.

212. Dmitrii D. Zelov, *Ofitsial'nye svetskie prazdniki kak iavlenie russkoi kul'tury kontsa XVII - pervoi poloviny XVIII veka* (Moscow: URSS, 2002), pp. 132-33 and 259-64.

also demonstrate the degree of overlap within the St Petersburg setting. For example, there is a movement associated with popular celebrations, discussed in the work of Mazaev, which is typically circular (unregulated movement around a defined centre), in contrast to the linear nature of State celebrations (consciously-controlled movement towards a fixed destination).²¹³ However, in both cases, the nature of the spaces which this model discusses is not as clear-cut as it suggests. Whilst the distinction is certainly present in St Petersburg, and it is clear in the number of triumphal marches and processions that occur within the city, making use of the arterial routes, there is a sense in which these two types of movement become confused with regard to the nature of the city itself. In other words, the centre of St Petersburg serves as the centre of the festive space, albeit with the movement around it more tightly regulated than in Mazaev's formulation of popular celebrations. As noted, this is not in relation to the very linear military celebrations, where there was a defined destination, as with the Church of the Trinity and the large square around it{3}, which were used for many of the early victory celebrations in St Petersburg. One could also point to the military exercises that took place on Trinity Square and Tsaritsyn Meadow as evidence of organised movement around a fixed centre, again challenging Mazaev's formulation.

A question also raised about the traditionally open nature of popular festivities, related to the issue of free movement, when one considers the controlled and regulated nature of St Petersburg, certainly much greater in degree than in other Russian cities of the period.²¹⁴ Although popular festivities occurred in a similar manner to other Russian towns, as we will see below, there remains the fact that they took place within the greater space of St Petersburg, a place which was not easily accessible, by virtue of its physical geography, and in which there were restrictions imposed by the city's authorities. Although this element of control will be discussed below, in Chapter Two, in relation to the city's police, it is an important factor when considering the 'public' nature of popular festivities and their relationship with St Petersburg.

Although the tendency in studying the development of St Petersburg has generally been to stress the secular elements at work in the city's planning, this overlooks the fact that, as in other Russian cities, churches were a key element in St Petersburg's everyday

213. Anatolii I. Mazaev, *Prazdnik kak sotsial'no-khudozhestvennoe iavlenie: opyt istoriko-teoreticheskogo issledovaniia* (Moscow: Nauka, 1978), p. 106.

214. Keller, *Prazdnichnaia kul'tura Peterburga*, p. 58.

life.²¹⁵ In her discussion of what she has termed the ‘aural landscape’ of St Petersburg, Chudinova highlights the importance of the cannon fire from the city’s fortresses (discussed above) as a secular means of telling the time, but she also points out that church bells remained a key part of everyday life, as in other Russian cities. The bells were rung not only to summon the congregation for the daily and weekly services, but also at certain points during the Church service itself, and they remained an established part of celebrations on feast-days and public celebrations in general.²¹⁶ Similarly, the centre of the city had originally been focused on the Church of the Holy Trinity and the open area immediately surrounding it on the Petersburg side, founded in October 1703, which played a central role in many of the city’s important early ceremonies. For example, Peter was granted the title of *Imperator* after a service in the church during the celebrations for the Peace of Nystadt in 1721.²¹⁷

However, under Peter’s successors, the focus gradually shifted toward the Admiralty side, where the Winter Palace and the city’s main avenue were located. The Church of the Nativity of the Virgin{24} on Nevskii prospekt, was consecrated in 1737 and soon became the centre of Court worship. It took possession of the icon of the Virgin of Kazan’, which was associated with the Romanov family, in the early 1740s and was subsequently renamed as a result.²¹⁸ It was the site of Imperial weddings, coronation anniversaries, name-day and birthday celebrations, and other significant religious occasions celebrated at Court. For example, the annual procession to the St Aleksandr Nevskii monastery on the saint’s day began at the Church of the Holy Mother of Kazan’.²¹⁹ Its position on Nevskii prospekt also led to its incorporation into other major celebrations, such as the ceremonial entry of both Anna Ivanovna and Elizabeth following their coronations in Moscow, which will be discussed further in Chapter Three. The major points throughout the city which have been discussed above, such as the Imperial palaces, the Summer Gardens and the leading churches, highlight the considerable degree to which the various spaces within St Petersburg - official,

215. Details of the city’s various churches for this period can be found in Bogdanov, *Opisanie Sanktpeterburga*, pp. 292-308 (for Orthodox) and 315-16 (for non-Orthodox).

216. Chudinova, ‘The Audio-Spatial Aspect of St Petersburg’, p. 60. Again, details of the number and size of the bells in the city’s main churches can be found in Bogdanov, *Opisanie Sanktpeterburga*, pp. 318-19.

217. Chudinova, ‘The Audio-Spatial Aspect of St Petersburg’, pp. 53-54.

218. Bogdanov, *Opisanie*, p. 302.

219. Simon Dixon, ‘Religious Ritual at the Eighteenth-Century Russian Court’ (forthcoming).

festive and religious - overlapped in everyday 'public' life within the city.

- Academic Pursuits

The final influence on the space of St Petersburg that will be examined is the various educational institutions which were spread across the city. Given the dispersed locations of many of these establishments - the Naval Academy on the Admiralty side, the Artillery School on the Liteinyi side, the Medical School on the Vyborg side, and the St Aleksandr Nevskii seminary attached to the monastery outside the city limits - the early city did not have a consolidated 'academic' space. However, the housing of the Academy of Sciences in the former palace of Tsaritsa Praskov'ia Fedorovna^{12}, which also contained the Kunstkamera and its library, on the Strelka on Vasil'evskii island, from 1729 was a major step toward providing an academic centre for the city. This process was further aided by the founding of the *Kadetskii korpus* in the Menshikov Palace in 1731, following its previous owner's exile to Siberia in 1727.²²⁰ In this section, I want to concentrate on the 'public' activities of the Academy of Sciences and its constituent parts - its role as a publisher will be discussed in Chapter Five.

The Academy of Sciences had been planned by Peter in conjunction with the German philosopher Gottfried Leibniz since the last years of the seventeenth century. The model drew on established European examples, such as the Royal Society (London), L'Académie Royale des Sciences (Paris) and, in particular, the Academy of Sciences in Berlin. The role envisaged for the Russian Academy of Sciences has been discussed by historians, taking into consideration the nature of the situation in Russia and Peter's personal motivations.²²¹ The purpose of the Academy was not merely to establish Russia on the academic map of Europe, although it was undoubtedly an important institution from a scientific research point-of-view, but in a wider sense to contribute to the 'civilisation' of the Russian elite. Although this was in part related to its role as an educational establishment, the Academy and its members were also intended to serve as an example or model (*obrazets*) for Russia, according to its 'Project', signed on 22 January 1724.²²² Peter's experience of the aforementioned

220. I. I. Liubimenko and R. M. Tonkova, 'Kul'turnaia zhizn' Peterburga', in *Peterburg petrovskogo vremeni: ocherki*, ed. by Anatolii V. Predtechenskii (Leningrad: Lenizdat, 1948), pp. 120-21.

221. Petr P. Pekarskii, *Istoriia Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk v Peterburge* (St Petersburg: Tip. Imp. Akademii Nauk, 1870-73), vol. I, pp. 5-6.

222. *PSZ*, vol. VII, no. 4443 (28 January 1724), pp. 220-24.

scientific institutions in Western Europe had demonstrated that such bodies encouraged a type of civilised discourse and internal order which Peter wished to see develop in Russian society.²²³

This wider ‘public’ role for the Academy was reflected in the activities set out in the ‘Project’. In addition to weekly meetings, which were to be attended by the academics and the ruler to discuss progress and view results, academics had to participate in wider ‘public’ meetings (referred to as ‘assemblies’) three times per year and also give a number of ‘public’ lectures.²²⁴ Although the identity of prospective attenders at such meetings and lectures was not elaborated in the ‘Project’, the staffing of the Academy itself made clear that this was to be a small and well-educated elite group. The fact that the Academy was initially dominated by foreign scholars meant that the languages of academic discourse were Latin or German, thereby restricting access to proceedings.²²⁵ Given the shortage of Russians with the necessary knowledge or interest to participate in these events, this meant that the prospective audience was reduced further still. However, the ‘Project’ included plans to create both a school (*gimnaziia*) and academic university attached to the Academy, with the aim being eventually to produce educated Russian students.²²⁶ The Academy was officially founded by Peter in a personal *ukaz* on 28 January 1724, although the Academy’s official opening actually took place after Peter’s death in November 1725.²²⁷

The Academy’s first ‘public’ assembly took place shortly afterwards, on 27 December 1726, in the house of Petr P. Shafirov and was attended by around four hundred Russian and foreign dignitaries. The varied composition of this audience makes clear that not all of them were present purely for intellectual reasons. For example, Feofan Prokopovich’s educated credentials are beyond reproach, whereas Aleksandr Menshikov, although an honorary Fellow of the Royal Society, could be said to represent the members of the Court elite attending for either political or social

223. Michael D. Gordin, ‘The Importance of Being Earnest: The Early St Petersburg Academy of Sciences’, *ISIS*, 91 (2000), pp. 15-16 and Simon Werrett, ‘An Odd Sort of Display’, pp. 64-66.

224. *PSZ*, vol. VII, no. 4443 (28 January 1724), p. 223.

225. Gary Marker, *Publishing, Printing, and the Origins of Intellectual Life in Russia, 1700-1800* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985), p. 46.

226. On the successes and failures of these two subsidiary bodies, see Ludmila Schulze, ‘The Russification of the St Petersburg Academy of Sciences and Arts in the Eighteenth Century’, *British Journal for the History of Science*, vol. 18 (1985), pp. 310-11.

227. *PSZ*, vol. VII, no. 4443 (28 January 1724), pp. 220-24.

reasons.²²⁸ The proceedings of this meeting were published in Königsberg later in the same year and it is interesting to note the stress placed on the beneficial nature of these assemblies for the people (*narod*). For example, Georg Bilfinger, professor of physics, unsurprisingly noted Peter's benign legacy in establishing order and discipline in Russia, using the Academy as an example, whilst Jacob Hermann, professor of mathematics, highlighted the need for such civilised discussions in the public arena, before moving on to more concrete academic matters.²²⁹ The account of the Academy's second public assembly, also in Shafirov's house, on 26 August 1726, followed a similar pattern - distinguished audience, praise for the ruler and then papers on scientific subjects. The link established between the Academy's roles as both an exemplary institution and a controlled space through these assemblies is convincingly argued by Werrett, although their wider reception outside the academic community remains very difficult to gauge.

The move to Tsaritsa Praskov'ia Fedorovna's former palace in 1729 provides another element within the discussion of the 'public' nature of the institution. The two-storey palace had a large central room flanked by ten rooms on either side, in a symmetrical design, on both floors. Space within the building was divided both in terms of the two floors and between the central area versus the wings. The ground floor contained the more technical elements of the Academy, such as the printing press, workshops and the bookshop (*knizhnaia lavka*), whereas the first floor housed the administration and conference rooms. Similarly, the main central areas were considered 'public' - on the ground floor, there was the entrance hall and, on the first floor, the room used for the public assemblies - whereas access to the wings was necessarily more restricted.²³⁰

Another area of the Academy where this question of access was directly addressed was in relation to its subsidiary institutions, principally its library and its museum, both of which were initially based on Peter's own collections. These collections were initially housed in the Summer Palace and then, from 1718, in the Kikin Palace (in the south of the city) after his execution. The museum began as Peter's

228. Werrett, 'An Odd Sort of Display', p. 63.

229. Werrett, 'An Odd Sort of Display', pp. 64-65.

230. Werrett, 'An Odd Sort of Display', pp. 75-76.

collection of curiosities, or *Kunstkamera*. His interest in this regard had been inspired by his visits to such collections during the Grand Embassy in 1697, particularly the anatomical collection of Heinrich Ruysch, which Peter subsequently purchased in 1717 for 30,000 ducats.²³¹ The *Kunstkamera* gradually grew in size through the acquisition of existing collections, such as that of Ruysch, gifts from foreign dignitaries, like the famous Globe of Gottorp (brought to St Petersburg in 1715), and Peter's own enthusiasm and scientific curiosity. For example, he issued an *ukaz* on 'monsters' (*monstry, to est' urody*) in 1718, which ordered any creatures, including humans, displaying deformities or other unusual characteristics to be reported to local officials, with a financial reward based on their condition. They could then be collected and sent to St Petersburg for analysis.²³²

Such collections of curiosities had predecessors in Russia, notably that of Peter's father Aleksei Mikhailovich.²³³ However, the *Kunstkamera* was distinctive in two respects, both of which are significant for this discussion of the Academy's wider 'public' role. Firstly, the collection forms part of the wider European interest in the relationship between science and nature in the early modern period, highlighted by Peter's own experiences in the Netherlands with regard to Ruysch's controversial collection. Given that Russian Orthodox tradition forbade the dissection of corpses and storage of body organs, due to the fear of the corpse rising to reclaim its component parts, it has been suggested that the *Kunstkamera* symbolises Peter's desire to demonstrate the scientific control of nature (and its discontents).²³⁴ Secondly, and closely related to the latter point, the *Kunstkamera* has traditionally been viewed as Russia's first 'public' museum, in contrast to the largely private collections of the Muscovite tsars, mentioned above.²³⁵ The collection was to be open to visitors, importantly with no entrance fee, despite suggestions by Pavel Iaguzhinskii to the contrary. As an incentive, visitors were to be offered complimentary coffee, wine or vodka, although given the nature of the collection, the latter may have been necessary to

231. Anthony Anemone, 'The Monsters of Peter the Great: The Culture of the St Petersburg *Kunstkamera* in the Eighteenth Century', *Slavic and East European Journal*, vol. 44 (2000), p. 586.

232. *PSZ*, vol. V, no. 3159 (13 February 1718).

233. Oleg Neverov, "'His Majesty's Cabinet" and Peter I's Kunstkammer', in *The Origins of Museums: The Cabinet of Curiosities in Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century Europe*, ed. by Oliver Impey and Arthur McGregor (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), pp. 54-61.

234. Anemone, 'The Monsters of Peter the Great', pp. 588-90.

235. Liubimenko and Tonkova, 'Kul'turnaia zhizn' Peterburga', p. 114.

steady the nerves.²³⁶

The library was also based largely on Peter's own collection, although again this was supplemented by foreign purchases and further expanded with the bequeathment of books from in the wills of scholars and other State officials. As with the *Kunstkamera*, the library was opened to a wider 'public' and the records of the Academy contain the names of early readers, such as Feofan Prokopovich and Iakov Brius.²³⁷ The wider 'public' purpose of both the library and the *Kunstkamera* was reflected in the publication of a descriptive booklet (or brochure) in 1741. This described the history of both the Academy of Sciences and the two collections, followed by a brief catalogue of their holdings and engravings of the building.²³⁸ In both cases, this accessibility was an important part of the 'public' responsibilities of the Academy of Sciences. The visual and visceral nature of the displays in the *Kunstkamera* also made it accessible to a much wider group of people than either the academic or printed output of the institution.

The Image of St Petersburg

Early depictions of the city tend to focus on the contrast between the large empty space of the river and the small number of isolated buildings, often merely a thin line against the horizon, as in the 1704 engraving by the Dutch artist Pieter Picart. This image of the city dominated by its natural surroundings continued despite St Petersburg's considerable development during this period. For example, an engraving by Christopher Marselius from 1725 showed St Petersburg from the perspective of an observer on Kronstadt, with the city reduced to a shoreline sandwiched between the river and the sky.²³⁹ However the desire of Peter and his publicists to show the city as a means of controlling and using nature was perhaps most clearly reflected in the work of another contemporary engraver, Aleksei Zubov, whose 'Panorama of St Petersburg' (1716) featured Peter and Catherine in one of the boats on the Neva. Grigorii Kaganov has

236. Jakob von Stählin, *Original Anecdotes of Peter the Great* (New York: Arno Press, 1970), p. 58.

237. *Istoriia Biblioteki Akademii nauk SSSR, 1714-1964*, ed. by Sergei P. Luppov and M. S. Fillipov (Leningrad: Nauka, 1964), p. 31.

238. *Palaty Sanktpeterburgskoi imperatorskoi Akademii nauk biblioteki i kunstkamery s kratkim pokazaniem vsekh nakhodiashchikhsia v nikh khudozhestvennykh i natural'nykh veshchei soochinennoe dlia okhotnikov onyia veshchi smotret' zhelaiushchikh* (St Petersburg: Tip. Akademii nauk, 1741).

239. Grigorii Kaganov, *Images of Space: St Petersburg in the Visual and Verbal Arts*, trans. by Sidney Monas (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997), pp. 1-10.

pointed out that this depiction of the city should be considered alongside the imagery used by Feofan Prokopovich, likening the city to the ship of St Peter, as part of the wider efforts to present the city as both a sacred space and a source of calmness in an otherwise wild (in the sense of uncontrolled) environment.²⁴⁰

As well as reflecting the impact of the city's geography and spaces on its perception by artists, such engravings and other depictions also helped create an image of the city for its inhabitants and a wider audience. Elizabeth commissioned the artist Mikhail Makhaev in 1746 to make a series of sketches of St Petersburg in preparation for a map and set of engravings to commemorate the anniversary of the founding of the city in 1753. He used a large optical cabinet, set up on various high points around the city (such as the Triumphal Gates on Nevskii prospekt and the observatory in the *Kunstkamera*), to project an image of the surroundings onto a sheet of paper which could then be traced around. Makhaev's work was overseen by the theatrical set designer, Giuseppe Valeriani, who checked each stage of the sketch and advised on the use of architectural plans for accuracy.²⁴¹ The resulting album was produced in the anniversary year for distribution amongst Russian and foreign dignitaries. Significantly, it was also re-engraved for a number of other formats, allowing its views of the city to be more widely disseminated. A good example of this was the reproductions which could be used with optical equipment, commonly a viewer based on a variation of the *camera obscura*, as a form of visual entertainment at fairs.²⁴²

Overall, the development of St Petersburg and its constituent spaces in this period had important consequences for the emergence of a 'public' in Russia. Firstly, the city was intended to be a reflection of the ideal of 'regularity', which can be linked to the wider theme of control. This can be seen in a number of areas, such as the design and construction of the city, with its architectural planning and the harnessing of natural elements encapsulating this goal. This was also apparent in the element of compulsion used during Peter's reign in relation to the interaction within the city's various spaces, such as the *assamblei*. Whilst the element of control was present in many of the aspects of 'public' life in St Petersburg, and is the focus of the following chapter, there was also

240. Grigorii Kaganov, "'As in the Ship of Peter'", *Slavic Review*, vol. 50 (1991), pp. 762-64.

241. Kaganov, *Images of Space*, pp. 19-21.

242. Kaganov, *Images of Space*, pp. 22-24.

a gradual trend toward self-regulation as a requirement to participate fully in the aforementioned social spaces, which will be examined in Chapters Four and Five. These areas can also be related to the ‘exemplary’ function of St Petersburg, in part linked to the city’s ‘regular’ nature, wherein its appearance and its various institutions were intended to provide a useful model or source of information for both its inhabitants and Russia as a whole. This can be seen in the role of the Academy of Sciences and its constituent bodies, such as the *Kunstkamera*.

Chapter Two - Controlling the Public

The numerous reforms introduced by Peter I have been linked to the concept of the early modern *Polizeistaat*, or ‘well-ordered police state’, wherein ‘police’ refers to the ‘institutional means and procedures necessary to secure peaceful and orderly existence for the population’.²⁴³ However, as one of the leading historians of early eighteenth-century Russia has noted, ‘police’ (*politsiia*) was not merely an institution, it was also a way of thinking about the authority and role of the State.²⁴⁴ This can be linked to the concept of social discipline insofar as the strong central authority of the State, which was also a key part of the *Polizeistaat*, was able to effectively control social behaviour. Following a discussion of the broader themes of such ‘police’ administrations and related concepts, such as social discipline and surveillance, this chapter will examine the role of Police Chancellery in St Petersburg in influencing and thereby helping to control many aspects of everyday ‘public’ life in the city. In particular, the wider themes of ‘regularity’ and ‘good order’, which have already been discussed in relation to the planning and construction of St Petersburg in Chapter One, were central to the activities of the Police Chancellery. The State’s intervention and regulation of ‘public’ life in this way can be seen through the legislation introduced in support of these activities and a number of areas will be detailed below. For example, the ‘good order’ of St Petersburg society relied upon its health and safety, which meant that the Police were responsible for dealing with any potential threats, including fire, disease and crime. The wider element of control represented by both the Police Chancellery and the relevant legislation will then be examined in relation to two specific areas of ‘public’ life - drinking and gambling - to illustrate the distinction made between the activities of the elite and the rest of the urban population.

Police Administration and Social Discipline

There has been some debate over the motives behind Peter I’s reforms, most notably in relation to the state’s need for more efficient means to generate revenue to fund its military activities during the Great Northern War.²⁴⁵ Whatever the motivation, it seems

243. Marc Raeff, *The Well-Ordered Police State: Social and Institutional Change through Law in the Germanies and Russia, 1600-1800* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983), p. 5.

244. Evgenii Anisimov, *The Reforms of Peter the Great: Progress through Coercion in Russia*, trans. by John T. Alexander (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1993), p. 217.

245. See, for example, Kliuchevskii’s argument that war was the ‘lever’ of reform: Vasilii O.

clear that, in order to achieve his aims, Peter drew on the example of the ‘police’ regulations (*Polizeiordnungen*) which developed predominantly in northern Europe, in states like Sweden and Prussia, during the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In part, such regulations reflected the ‘absolute’ authority of the ruler in Protestant states following the Reformation, but they were also prompted by the need to increase domestic productivity to meet the demands of military developments in the same period.²⁴⁶ Although early modern Russian society did not undergo the same process of change, two important factors altered the situation in Russia from the mid seventeenth century. The first factor was the *Raskol* (Schism), which undermined the Church’s position as the principal source of moral and cultural authority within Russian society. The second factor was the gradual turn towards the West in the upper reaches of Russian society, reflected in increased trade with Western Europe, the larger number of Europeans coming to Muscovy, and the appearance of some European elements in elite Russian culture.²⁴⁷ Both of these factors contributed to a loss of ‘cultural identity’, which can be linked to the wider sense of crisis in the 1670s and 1680s, reflected in popular protests against taxation, *strel'tsy* revolts, the contested succession to Fedor Alekseevich in 1682 and the failure of campaigns against the Crimea. Raeff argues that, in the face of this crisis, there appeared to be no means within the Muscovite system to deal with the situation adequately.²⁴⁸

At the same time, this process of change within late Muscovite cultural identity, in particular the challenge to the centrality of the Orthodox Church, raises the related subject of social discipline. A distinction should be drawn between ‘social discipline’ and ‘social control’, although they are certainly linked and often reinforced one another. ‘Social discipline’ has been defined as a ‘conscious effort’ by a central authority to change social attitudes and behaviour. ‘Social control’ refers instead to the traditional rules and practices within any society.²⁴⁹ The upheaval within European society as a

Kliuchevskii, *Peter the Great*, transl. by Liliana Archibald (London: MacMillan Press, 1968), especially pp. 57, 84 and 157.

246. Marc Raeff, ‘The Well-Ordered Police State and the Development of Modernity in Seventeenth and Eighteenth-Century Europe: An Attempt at a Comparative Approach’, *American Historical Review*, vol. 80 (1975), pp. 1223-24.

247. Raeff, *The Well-Ordered Police State*, pp. 188-91.

248. Raeff, *The Well-Ordered Police State*, pp. 193-94.

249. Lars Behrisch, ‘Social Discipline in Early Modern Russia, Seventeenth to Nineteenth Centuries’, in *Institutionen, Instrumente und Akteure sozialer Kontrolle und Disziplinierung im frühneuzeitlichen Europa*, ed. by Heinz Schilling (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klosterman, 1999), p. 325.

result of the Reformation and the attendant changes which both contributed to and followed from it, such as the rapid development of printing and the rise of humanist education, led to a change in social attitudes. Reason increasingly became a factor in determining how social relationships were to be assessed and thereby determining ‘appropriate’ behaviour within these relationships.²⁵⁰

Although there is a good case to be made for the Orthodox Church’s authority with regard to social discipline during the same period, its position of moral authority was steadily undermined by the Schism and the inclusion of secular punishments for crimes formerly dealt with by the Church in the *Ulozhenie* (1649).²⁵¹ During the reign of Peter I, and particularly after the death of Patriarch Adrian in 1700, the State gradually subsumed the Church in this role, a process compounded by the introduction of the Holy Synod in 1721, by which the Church became part of the State administration. Indeed, it was during the reign of Peter I that a strong central State authority began to make the aforementioned ‘conscious effort’ to change the attitude and behaviour of at least a section of Russian society for its own purposes, and the Church was intended to become a means to extend that authority.²⁵²

During Peter’s reign, the emphasis placed on ‘good order’, embodied in a ‘police’ administration, was part and parcel of the general reform agenda. The example of foreign state practice, in particular that of Sweden, was an important influence on Peter - all aspects of ‘public’ life could be controlled through ‘good government’ to contribute to the more efficient working of the State. This was also a feature of contemporary Cameralist writing, although this body of thought would appear more prominently in the legislation of Catherine II.²⁵³ A useful reflection of this desire to regulate the wider Russian population can be seen in the revision of census information (*reviziia*) between 1719-24. The information collected was used to make the collection of the ‘soul’ tax, from 1724, more efficient and to prevent unauthorised peasant migration, following the introduction of ‘passports’ in April 1722.²⁵⁴

The desire for ‘good order’ was also reflected in Peter’s *General’nyi Reglament*

250. Marc Raeff, ‘Transfiguration and Modernisation’, pp. 334-35.

251. Behrisch, ‘Social Discipline in Early Modern Russia’, pp. 338-39.

252. Anisimov, *Reforms of Peter the Great*, p. 217.

253. Raeff, ‘The Well-Ordered Police State’, pp. 1236-37.

254. Anisimov, *Reforms of Peter the Great*, pp. 225-26.

(1720), which contained a strict set of regulations for the staff of the State administration to follow. These dealt not only with official procedures, but also the organisation of office space and one's behaviour within it. Although appearing over-meticulous to a modern observer, the *Reglament* sought to remove the possibility of personal, or indeed one could use the term 'private', concerns from government.²⁵⁵ Smith points out that this aspect of the early modern *Polizeistaat* can be linked to the concept of the 'official' public in Habermas's work on the 'public sphere', discussed in the Introduction. In other words, a state institution could only be considered 'public' if it was intended to serve the 'common good'.²⁵⁶ The fact that Peter I made the distinction between public and private concerns, providing definitions for the terms *publichnyi* and *privatnyi* in the glossary to the *Reglament* (discussed above, in the Introduction), and stressed the importance of service to the State highlights the relationship between the 'police' administration and the development of a 'public'.

Although Peter tried to introduce many elements of this 'modernising' European *Polizeistaat*, he was necessarily limited by the nature of Russian society and its social groups, upon whom he had to rely for its effective implementation. Indeed, it was the desire for a 'regular' system to society, in the aftermath of the *Ulozhenie* (1649), that led to the amalgamation of various smaller social groups, such as the *odnodvortsy*, who lost their minor noble status and became State peasants. With regard to the State's role as the central authority in social discipline, the Petrine reforms enjoyed considerable success in changing the social and cultural lives of the nobility, certainly in terms of their appearance and forms of interaction, both of which will be discussed below. Their views on their role in society proved harder to change, but there can be little doubt that service to the State had a long-term impact on the nobility, not only with regard to their relationship with the State but also their development as a cohesive elite. Although the wider impact on Russian society (i.e. the rural peasantry) is debatable, due to the shortage of personnel and finance, the Police Chancellery's role within St Petersburg society was more fully supported, given the city's status as the capital and the residency of the Court.²⁵⁷ It was also given a clearer definition of its duties, discussed below.

255. Raeff, *The Well-Ordered Police State*, pp. 203-4.

256. Smith, *Working the Rough Stone*, p. 56.

257. Raeff, 'The Well-Ordered Police State', p. 1238.

Police in St Petersburg

For the urban population, the 'police' administration was given institutional form in May 1718, with the establishment of the Police Chancellery in St Petersburg.²⁵⁸ It was headed by Anton M. Devier, who had come to Russia with Peter I from Amsterdam following the Great Embassy. Interestingly, the inspiration for this move came from a French, rather than German, model and drew on the office of the *lieutenant-général de police* of Paris, first appointed by Louis XIV in 1667, although the institution was clearly linked to the wider concept of *polizeiordnungen*.²⁵⁹ It encapsulated many of the aspects of control discussed above in relation to St Petersburg. For example, it was responsible for most aspects of 'public' life in the city, including hygiene (proper disposal of waste), safety (preventing fires and hunting brigands) and conduct of business (ensuring order in the city's markets, regulating of prices and standardising weights). In addition, the office was charged with overseeing the appearance of the city itself - it was to approve and monitor all new building work, ensure that the city's embankments and streets were properly maintained, and keep its waterways clear.²⁶⁰

The police were also responsible for the maintenance of public order, which involved not only preventing fights and other disturbances, but also overseeing the regulation of any entertainments and social gatherings. Anyone wishing to hold a 'public' event, such as a ball or a theatrical performance, had to apply to the Police Chancellery for permission.²⁶¹ This also extended to a more general surveillance of the city's population. All movement within, into and out of the city was monitored, especially at night when sentries and night watches were posted at various points around the city - only authorised people, carrying lanterns, were allowed to pass. The safety of the city at night was also addressed by the introduction of Russia's first street lights in St Petersburg's squares, around important State buildings and along its main streets (in other words, 'public' places).²⁶² The surveillance of the population was also aided by the

258. The duties of the Police Chancellery were issued two weeks before the announcement of the appointment of Devier as *general-politsmeister* on 7th June 1718: *Zakonodatel'stvo Petra I*, ed. by A. A. Preobrazhenskii and T. E. Novitskaia (Moscow: Iuridicheskaiia literatura, 1997), pp. 630-32.

259. Sidney Monas, 'Anton Divier and the Police of St Petersburg', in *For Roman Jakobson: Essays on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. by Morris Halle (The Hague: Mouton, 1956), p. 364.

260. *Zakonodatel'stvo Petra I*, p. 631.

261. Predtechenskii, 'Naselenie i byt Peterburga', pp. 140-42.

262. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 220.

census taken of each house and its inhabitants.²⁶³ The inhabitants of the city were expected to maintain their own vigilance. Those failing to inform the Police Chancellery of any wrong-doing faced the prospect of fines or a spell in the galleys.²⁶⁴

The police also had to deal with anti-social groups, in other words, those elements within urban society who either did not fulfil a 'useful' function or were in fact counterproductive to its 'good order', which included beggars and prostitutes. The question of how to deal with vagrants and beggars in an urban setting had been current since the early 1690s, when Peter I issued a series of *ukazy* ordering them to be thrown out of Moscow and other towns - if they tried to return, they were to be flogged and sent to Siberia.²⁶⁵ There were several reasons for this attitude. Firstly, such people lacked a permanent address and the appropriate papers to stay in towns: consequently they were difficult to tax and contributed little to the state. Secondly, they were frequently linked to criminal activities and, in the case of beggars, the feigning of injury to gain alms. In both cases, this flew in the face of Peter's well-established 'work ethic' and such people were targeted by a series of laws throughout his reign. Both laziness and criminal activity were raised in a number of *ukazy* on police activities in St Petersburg in the early 1720s. Beggars and idle young people were banned from the streets, to prevent crime, and anyone giving alms to beggars was to be fined five roubles. The official advice to charitable individuals was to give such money to worthy institutions, like the city's hospitals.²⁶⁶ The subject of 'fake cripples' was addressed in the Spiritual Regulation, in which it was stated that anyone giving alms to them was complicit in their fraudulent crime and would be punished as such.²⁶⁷ Begging was considered unacceptable and offenders were to be punished by being sent to work in a factory.²⁶⁸

Prostitution was a common element of everyday life in an urban setting, especially in a major port like St Petersburg. Interestingly, it was also a practice later associated with the term *publichnyi*, as in *publichnaia zhenshchina* and *publichnyi dom*.

263. S. R. Dolgova, "'... ekhat' i perepisat' imianno bez medleniia": Pervye zhiteli Peterburga. 1717 g.', *Istoricheskii arkhiv*, no. 2 (2003), pp. 7-20.

264. Monas, 'Anton Divier and the Police', p. 365.

265. See, for example, *PSZ*, vol. III, no. 1420 (22 November 1691), p. 117 and no. 1424 (30 November 1691), pp. 119-20.

266. *PSZ*, vol. VI, no. 3676 (16 November 1720), p. 264.

267. Feofan Prokopovich, *The Spiritual Regulation of Peter the Great*, ed. and transl. by Alexander V. Muller (Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 1972), pp. 54-55.

268. *PSZ*, vol. XIII, no. 10095 (29 April 1753), p. 828.

Although, traditionally, the focus of Orthodox censure tended to fall on the individual consequences of sexual immorality, embodied especially in the practice of prostitution, the presence and tacit toleration of such activities within a community could have serious implications for its inhabitants. This was reflected in a number of moral tales from the seventeenth century, such as the story of a village which turned a blind eye to the presence of a prostitute and was consequently punished by God through the corruption of their water supply.²⁶⁹ During the reign of Peter I, this religious disapproval was combined with the acknowledgement that prostitution created a number of practical problems which could threaten the 'good order' of both the State and society. Of particular concern was the question of sexual disease, carried both by prostitutes and their regular clients, which could have a serious impact on the 'public' health of the urban community. Given the demand on manpower at the height of the Great Northern War, it is hardly surprising that steps were taken by Peter and his military staff to minimise the impact of such diseases on their troops by tackling the problem of prostitution. As well as attempting to limit the practice around army camps, efforts were made to shut down the brothels which had appeared in St Petersburg by 1718, another indication of Western influence on the new city.²⁷⁰

The link between the existence of brothels in St Petersburg and the large number of unmarried military personnel was again made in a 1730 report to the city's *Magistrat* on the subject of prostitution. To prevent the spread of disease, it advised that the brothels should be closed, prostitutes should be beaten with rods and any woman infecting three men should be sent to a 'house of correction'.²⁷¹ A more high-profile campaign against organised prostitution was conducted during the reign of Elizabeth, instigated on the advice of her influential confessor Fedor Dubianskii.²⁷² The focus of this investigation was the activities of a German 'madame', Anna-Cunegonda Felker, also known as 'Dresdensha', who ran a brothel out of a rented house on Voznesenskaia ulitsa in St Petersburg. She used the cover of holding dance evenings in this house to allow paying clients, who included nobles, Guards officers, civil officials and

269. Eve Levin, *Sex and Society in the World of the Orthodox Slavs, 900-1700* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989), pp. 74-76.

270. *Zakonodatel'stvo Petra I*, pp. 155-232.

271. Semenova, *Byt i naselenie*, pp. 128-29.

272. Pyliaev, *Staryi Peterburg*, pp. 155-56.

merchants, to view and select her women, of both foreign (usually German) and native Russian backgrounds.²⁷³ Felker's arrest and interrogation by the Police Chancellery revealed the extent of the problem facing the city's authorities. She provided information about her regular clients, including Prince Boris V. Golitsyn, in whose houses girls were often placed to act as 'servants'. She also revealed the main soliciting areas in St Petersburg, and this resulted in around 500 arrests, with the foreign prostitutes deported and the Russians sent to Orenburg.²⁷⁴ Measures against prostitution also featured in the proposed law codes during the latter stages of Elizabeth's reign: brothels were to be closed, their owners whipped and the prostitutes sent to a mill.²⁷⁵

Another area related to the issue of 'public' health and accessible to a paying clientele were the city's commercial bath-houses (*torgovye bani*, as distinct from privately-owned bath-houses). These were dotted across St Petersburg: according to Bogdanov's description from 1751, there were at least nine examples in the city and its immediate surroundings. They were generally located either in peripheral areas, such as by the *Galernyi dvor* on the Moika river, by the Obukhov bridge or on Vasil'evskii island, or attached to larger institutions, like the St Aleksandr Nevskii monastery or the garrisons of the Preobrazhenskii and Semenovskii Guards regiments.²⁷⁶ Although the origins of the Russian *bania* are obscure, they begin to appear in traveller's accounts from the sixteenth century onwards. Such foreign descriptions tended to focus mainly on the coarse behaviour of the bathers and the other seedy aspects of Russian bathing. In particular, the tendency of the sexes to mingle in close proximity to one another (for example, outside segregated bath-houses) was thought to lend itself all too easily to immoral activities in the opinion of observers like Adam Olearius and Johann Korb.²⁷⁷ On the other hand, Russians generally held a relaxed attitude toward mixed bathing throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, although this began to change at the

273. Although Semenova notes that the entrance fee for these evenings was comparatively high, between fifty kopecks and a ruble, this was not unusual for other dance evenings from the same period, discussed below in Chapter Four: Semenova, *Byt i naselenie*, pp. 127-28.

274. Semenova, *Byt i naselenie*, pp. 125-127.

275. *Proekty ugodnago ulozheniia 1754-1766 godov*, ed. by Aleksandr A. Vostokov (St Petersburg: Tip. M. M. Stasliusevicha, 1882), pp. 169-70.

276. Bogdanov, *Opisanie Sanktpeterburga*, pp. 201-2.

277. Olearius, *The Travels of Olearius*, pp. 142 and 161; Johann-Georg Korb, *Diary of an Austrian Secretary of Legation at the Court of Czar Peter the Great*, ed. and transl. by Count MacDonnell (London: Frank Cass, 1968), vol. II, pp. 199-200.

turn of the eighteenth century.²⁷⁸ Although this was in part due to the influence of these Western attitudes and the greater awareness of appropriate behaviour (discussed in Chapter Five), it also reflects a recognition that *bania* were commonly used as a meeting place by prostitutes and their clients.

As a result, mixed bathing was addressed in two *ukazy* during Elizabeth's reign, initially in 1743 in relation to St Petersburg and subsequently in 1760 for the rest of the empire. The first *ukaz* resulted from a debate (*rassuzhdenie*) in the Senate about the existence of mixed bathing in the city's commercial baths, which was described as 'absolutely disgusting' (*ves'ma protivno*). *Prokuror* Batiushkin from the Police Chancellery was summoned to explain whether an inspection (*smotrenie*) had taken place, and he confirmed that this practice had been discovered in one of the baths. The Police Chancellery had issued an *ukaz* regarding the proprietors (*tseloval'niki*) of the offending baths to the *Kamer-Kontora*, which was responsible for their regulation. The Senate confirmed this *ukaz* and recommended the strict imposition of fines on the guilty parties in future.²⁷⁹ The second *ukaz* was issued by the Senate in August 1760 and noted that, despite prohibitive legislation, the practice of mixed bathing had continued. Both the Police Chancellery and the *Kamer-Kontora* were instructed to redouble their efforts and the ban was extended to all cities.²⁸⁰ However, it clearly remained a concern for the authorities as Catherine II included, as Article 71 of her *Ustav blagochiniia* (April 1782), the stipulation that bathhouses were to be kept away from other buildings and should have clearly-marked separate entrances for men and women.²⁸¹ The measures taken against mixed bathing should be considered alongside those against prostitution, discussed above, insofar as they reflected a concern for the moral 'good order' of urban society.

Drinking

Drinking has a long and infamous association with the Russian people, even to the point where it was recorded as one of the reasons for Vladimir's decision to convert to

278. Anthony Cross, 'The Russian Banya in the Descriptions of Foreign Travellers and in the Depictions of Foreign and Russian Artists', *Oxford Slavonic Papers [NS]*, vol. 24 (1991), pp. 35-39.

279. *PSZ*, vol. XI, no. 8842 (21 December 1743), p. 984.

280. *PSZ*, vol. XV, no. 11094 (31 August 1760), p. 499.

281. Cross, 'The Russian Banya', pp. 40-41.

Orthodox Christianity, rather than Islam, by the Russian Primary Chronicle.²⁸² Certainly, early foreign observers, such as Adam Olearius, were quick to note the drunken behaviour of the Russians in the days immediately before the start of one of the major fasts, such as Shrovetide (*Maslenitsa*).²⁸³ Whether or not this was part of a wider negative stereotype of a ‘barbaric’ people, there can be little doubt that alcohol was a common feature of everyday Russian life. The production of alcohol was dominated by several factors, not least a surplus of grain and the timber necessary to build the distilling equipment, and consequently the majority of production took place in rural areas where these resources were located. On the other hand, beer and mead could be brewed in an urban setting, a more convenient location given the limited ‘shelf-life’ of these drinks in comparison with their bottled brethren.²⁸⁴ In either setting, alcohol was generally readily available, except in the case of poor harvests, and consequently the Russian State was not slow to realise its economic potential. It was strictly controlled by a State monopoly, with distillers/brewers having to pay an excise (*aktsiz*) on all alcohol produced.²⁸⁵ Given this background, it is important to note the change which took place in the first half of the eighteenth century with regard to official attitudes to drinking and drunkenness. On the one hand, it was an important, traditional element in both everyday and particularly festive life for the majority of the populace, even within the Court elite, especially during Peter I’s reign. However, at the same time, the development of the Court, influenced by ideas on appropriate behaviour and more sophisticated forms of entertainment, and the desire of the State to curb excessive drunkenness demonstrated a desire to control this facet of public life.

Peter himself had developed his drinking prowess in the convivial surroundings of the *Nemetskaia sloboda*, which was not far from the palace at Preobrazhenskoe where he spent much of his youth. It is perhaps not surprising that a vintner, Mr Mons (father of Anna and Willem, both later to become intimately connected to the imperial family), and such hard-drinking military men as the Swiss Franz Lefort and the Scotsman

282. *The Russian Primary Chronicle*, transl. by Samuel H. Cross and Olgerd P. Shobowitz-Wetzer (New York: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1953), p. 97.

283. Olearius, *The Travels of Olearius*, pp. 143-45 and 270.

284. R. E. F. Smith and David Christian, *Bread and Salt: A Social and Economic History of Food and Drink in Russia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), pp. 200-1.

285. Smith and Christian, *Bread and Salt*, p. 208. One example of the legislation on the alcohol duty is *PSZ*, vol. VIII, no. 5706 (19 February 1731), p. 387.

Patrick Gordon were amongst his early social acquaintances in this setting. In particular, Lefort's close relationship with Peter meant that his palace was used to host receptions, banquets and other celebrations which featured 'debauchery and drunkenness so great that it is impossible to describe it', according to one contemporary.²⁸⁶ As noted above, heavy drinking was a persistent feature of Petrine social life. It is telling that several of Peter's close circle died as a result of their alcohol intake - for example, Fedor Golovin - a fact which Peter himself noted in warning Admiral Fedor Apraksin about his enthusiastic imbibing.²⁸⁷ At the same time, such pursuits were hardly unknown in contemporary European courts and, although Peter's enthusiasm may have been disconcerting, not to say dangerous on occasion, the complaints contained in the accounts of Juel, Bergholz and other foreign observers should be balanced with the common foreign perception of Russians as inveterate drunkards. Peter was certainly able to moderate his behaviour when necessary. For example, during the Grand Embassy, Princess Sophia of Hanover noted after meeting Peter in Koppenbrücke, 'he did not get drunk in our presence, but we had hardly left when the people of his suite made ample amends.'²⁸⁸

The infamous 'All-Drunken Assembly' has long been associated with Peter's hedonistic tendencies and had its origins in the early 1690s, a period in which Peter was still relatively free to indulge his passions away from the attention of his mother and Patriarch Adrian. Recent work on the 'Assembly' has moved away from the traditional interpretation as either simple bacchanalia or religious parody to focus on its role as an important part of Court life, given the prominent positions that its members enjoyed within Peter's civil and military administration.²⁸⁹ It has also been persuasively argued that, far from being anti-religious, both the 'Assembly' and Peter's other entertainments, such as the war games and mock weddings, were intended to bind his company together and demonstrate their role in 'bringing order out of chaos'.²⁹⁰ An excerpt from Just Juel's account suggests another possible motivation for these heavy drinking sessions:

286. Prince Boris Kurakin, quoted in Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 14.

287. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 419.

288. Quoted in Eugene Schuyler, *Peter the Great, Emperor of Russia: A Study of Historical Biography* (New York: Russell and Russell, 1967), vol. 1, p. 286.

289. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, pp. 250-57.

290. Zitser, *The Transfigured Kingdom*, p. 12.

But still the tsar himself rarely drinks more than one or, at most, two bottles of wine, so that I rarely saw him drunk as a cobbler. In the meantime he compels the remaining guests to drink until they cannot see or hear anything, and then the tsar undertakes to gossip with them, attempting to find out what each has on his mind.²⁹¹

Anisimov links this assertion to his wider point on the importance of surveillance and denunciation in Petrine Russia. In a similar vein, he later notes the example of Count Petr Tolstoi, whom Peter accused of feigning drunkenness in order to observe his companions in a compromised state.²⁹² Peter was keen to ensure that other participants matched (or in some case, exceeded) his considerable intake. For example, Bergholz noted the comments made by the tsar, during a ten hour drinking session in St Petersburg on 11 August 1723, about why his guests should drink with him.²⁹³

Several reasons can be put forward, some of which have wider resonance in the context of Peter's reign. Firstly, the trials that guests were put through could be linked to a form of cruel (one could say, torturous) entertainment, intended to amuse the tsar.²⁹⁴ This had a long tradition in Russia, especially in the accounts of foreign visitors, although the 'barbarity' of the Russian people is a theme that many writers from 'civilised' Western countries were often keen to exaggerate.²⁹⁵ For example, Bergholz notes with some horror the example made of *gofmarshal* Vasilii D. Olsuf'ev's German wife, Eva, who was punished (along with twenty-nine other women) for failing to attend a masquerade in November 1721 by having to drink a penalty, despite being heavily pregnant. The result was a still-born child the following morning.²⁹⁶ The use of alcohol, either to loosen the tongues of his subjects or foreign representatives, or to promote a sense of unity and common purpose amongst his social circle, or even as a source of crude entertainment for the tsar, nevertheless played a central part in Court life under Peter.

Several other aspects of drinking culture changed during Peter's reign and these

291. Quoted in Anisimov, *Reforms of Peter the Great*, p. 21.

292. Anisimov, *Reforms of Peter the Great*, p. 208.

293. Bergholz, 'Dnevnik', *Iunost' derzhavy*, pp. 32-33 and 125.

294. Dmitri Zakharine, 'Tanz- und Körperverhalten im kommunikativen Alltagsverkehr des 17.-19. Jh. Russland und Westeuropa im Vergleich', *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, vol. 47 (2001), p. 151.

295. Marshall Poe, *A People Born to Slavery: Russia in Early Modern European Ethnography, 1476-1748* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000), pp. 149-50.

296. Bergholz, 'Dnevnik', *Neistovyi reformator*, p. 238.

were gradually refined throughout the eighteenth century. For example, wine (in other words, *vinogradnoe vino*) was imported to Russia during this period from France, Germany and Hungary, and became an established part of the Court's inventory, possibly due to its association with elite drinking in the rest of Europe. Peter had a particular fondness for strong Hungarian wine and it was used for toasts at many celebrations. Alongside other imported drinks, notably cognac, wine enjoyed a status as something of a luxury item, demonstrated by the fact that the quantity imported stayed relatively low throughout the eighteenth century.²⁹⁷ Along with such Western drinks, there were the associated social conventions, such as the manner of serving wine at table and the practice of toasting at major Court celebrations. Not all of these were purely concerned with alcohol either, as shown by the provision on non-traditional non-alcoholic drinks such as tea, coffee, chocolate and lemonade at these events. Bergholz mentions a *kofeinyi dom* near Trinity Square in St Petersburg called the 'Four Frigates' (*Chetyre frigata*), presumably in reference to the nearby wooden pyramid of the same name which commemorated the capture of four Swedish frigates by Prince Golitsyn.²⁹⁸ This was used by members of both the foreign community and the Court, not least to seek (temporary) refuge from Peter's demanding social schedule.²⁹⁹ These drinks also required a number of related accoutrements, such as tea and coffee services, and these served as a reflection of a person's wealth and status not dissimilar to clothing (discussed below).³⁰⁰

Details on drinking beyond the immediate confines of the Court are more difficult to find. The demands of the Great Northern War and the failure of harvests (for example, in 1708) had a direct impact on alcohol production, but, as with other elements of traditional culture during Peter's reign, in general drinking habits simply did not change, particularly in rural areas. Similarly, despite the introduction of new regular celebrations on the calendar, such as the anniversaries of major victories and the ruler's coronation, during Peter's reign (discussed above in Chapter Two), the nature of popular festivities remained essentially the same. The terms used to refer to public

297. Smith and Christian, *Bread and Salt*, p. 176.

298. Bergholz, 'Dnevnik', *Neistovyi reformator*, p. 206.

299. Bergholz, 'Dnevnik', *Neistovyi reformator*, p. 229.

300. For a useful discussion of these accoutrements at Court banquets in this period, see Natal'ia Kazakevich, *Tsarskie zastol'ia v XVIII veke: tseremonial i dekorativnoe oformlenie paradnykh stolov pri dvore imperatrity Elizavety i Ekateriny II* (St Petersburg: Zolotaia kniga, 2003).

drinking places in Russia during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries generally had their origins in Polish, such as *avsteriia* (hostelry), *fartina* (drink shop) and *postoiialyi dvor* (coaching inn).³⁰¹ Although these words were still used in the early eighteenth century, there is some evidence to suggest that new terms were gradually introduced. An *ukaz* in April 1734 refers to taverns (*traktiry*), with reference to their ownership and the collection of the excise, primarily using another term - *vol'nye domy*.³⁰² Although certainly not linked to the British tradition of 'free houses', a term with twentieth-century origins, it is interesting to note the link here between drinking and a rough equivalent to the term 'public house'.

The following year, another *ukaz* mentions both *piteinye domy* and *traktiry* in its title, but in the main text uses the terms *kabaki* and *vol'nye domy* instead. The intent of the *ukaz* was clear regardless - pages and chamber-pages of the Imperial household were forbidden from entering such establishments, either to drink or to play billiards, cards and other similar games. Offenders were to be placed under arrest (an example of the page Ivan Volkov was mentioned - *a pushche smotret' Pazha Ivana Volkova*) and the proprietor of the establishment also faced severe punishment, including a fine.³⁰³ A former *kabak*, apparently known as the 'Petrovskii', on the corner of the future Nevskii prospekt on the Admiralty side was bought by the *Kamer-kontora* and the Court in April 1737, with the aim of building a stone *traktir* for use by foreigners and other guests of the city's *Ratusha*.³⁰⁴ The term *kabak* was allegedly replaced by *piteinyi dom* by *ukaz* in 1746, although there is little evidence to suggest that this was followed in either official or everyday usage - subsequent legislation on the subject in 1765 and 1779 indicates that the terms continued to be interchangeable.³⁰⁵

The social and financial side-effects of alcohol can be seen in some of the legislation of the period. For example, an *ukaz* issued by the Senate in August 1735 outlawed the practice of accepting items of clothing, household items or other goods as payment for drinks in *kabaki* and *vol'nye domy*, since it was linked to theft. Lists of prices were to be issued by the *Kamer-kontora* for spirits, beer and mead, which

301. Smith and Christian, *Bread and Salt*, p. 215.

302. *PSZ*, vol. IX, no. 6566 (5 April 1734), pp. 301-3.

303. *PSZ*, vol. IX, no. 6703 (5 March 1735), p. 489.

304. *PSZ*, vol. X, no. 7233 (19 April 1737), p. 130.

305. Smith and Christian, *Bread and Salt*, p. 216.

proprietors and their staff had to charge patrons.³⁰⁶ More seriously, in October 1740, following the murder of a sentry in the Sts Peter and Paul fortress and the theft of several hundred roubles, it was ordered that there should be no noise or fighting at night, with the goal of maintaining good order in the city at night and therefore not require the involvement of the sentry patrols of the police. As a result, *kabaki* and *vol'nye domy* were only permitted to sell alcohol between 9am and 7pm. Those who failed to observe this ban were to be reported to the Police Chancellery.³⁰⁷ In this particular case, the link was established between violent crime and alcohol, with reference to the existing curfew in St Petersburg.

On a wider social scale, but nevertheless cutting to the heart of drinking as a common feature of feast-day celebrations, an implicit link was made between drinking and inappropriate behaviour on such occasions. In July 1743, the Senate, acting on the advice of the Holy Synod, addressed the issue of *kabaki* opening to sell drinks during the Liturgy or the procession of the Cross at monasteries and in larger parishes as part of the religious celebrations on Church holidays (*v khramovye prazdniki*). The same *ukaz* also mentioned other unsuitable activities that were taking place at the same time - fist-fighting, horse-racing, peasant dances (*pliaski*) and other 'unrefined' (*bezchinnyi*) activities. The *ukaz* noted that this issue had previously been addressed in a debate in the Holy Synod in September 1722, followed by a ruling from the Senate, but the implication is that this had not been effective. Finally it was added that the Empress also ordered a ban on fist-fighting in both St Petersburg and Moscow on 3 July.³⁰⁸ An *ukaz* preventing the construction of *piteinye domy* and similar buildings near churches or graveyards in early 1747 was most likely motivated by the desire to ensure respect for sanctified land, but it certainly also fits with the other anti-drunken behaviour legislation issued in the same period.³⁰⁹

There are other contemporary examples to suggest that Elizabeth took the issue of public drunkenness seriously, particularly in St Petersburg. For example, in December 1742, Elizabeth issued an *ukaz* dealing with the appearance of the streets in St Petersburg, which noted her disapproval for having taverns (*kabaki*) and eating-houses

306. *PSZ*, vol. IX, no. 6786 (12 August 1735), pp. 558-59.

307. *PSZ*, vol. X, no. 8260 (17 October 1740), p. 275.

308. *PSZ*, vol. XI, no. 8759 (11 July 1743), p. 847.

309. *PSZ*, vol. XII, no. 9365 (26 January 1747), pp. 642-45.

(*kharchevny*) on the city's 'distinguished' streets (*v sikh znatnykh liniakh*), presumably indicating the main avenues which contained the houses of the leading noble families. In the case of taverns, she ordered that they should be moved to particular sites (*vo osoblivykh mestakh*), presumably referring to the use of existing houses to sell alcohol (see below for examples), and in the case of eating-houses, that they should be confined to the market-place.³¹⁰ However, in 1746, Elizabeth again issued an *ukaz* stating that no *kabaki* should be situated on the aforementioned streets (*po bol'shim znatnym ulitsam*), but rather on side-streets, and that those which currently occupied such a location should be moved.³¹¹ A further *ukaz* in October 1752 reiterated the need to move both *kabaki* and *kharchevny* away from these distinguished streets. The fact that it specifically noted the location of a *kabak* on Millionnaia ulitsa, opposite the old Winter Palace on the Moika river, suggests that the failure to enforce the previous legislation was readily apparent to the empress.³¹²

The situation came to a head in December 1758, when General-Fieldmarshal and General-Procurator Prince Nikita Trubetskoi submitted a report to the Senate about actions taken against *kabaki* which contravened the various laws. He had launched an investigation to find out which houses on the city's main streets contained *kabaki* or similar establishments. Amongst those discovered were that of the merchant Chirkin, in *Kamer-fur'er* Rubanovskii's house on Millionnaia ulitsa, and others in the houses of the merchant Gnevyshev and Zherebtsov (vice-governor of Moscow), both of which were on Lugovaia ulitsa.³¹³ Importantly, the point of this exercise was not to destroy these establishments but to ensure that they were moved to a more suitable location - in other words, out of view. Hence, the *kabak* in Gnevyshev's house was moved to that of Princess Cherkasskaia on Malaia Morskaia ulitsa, whilst Chirkin's *kabak* was moved to a stone building on a vacant lot beside Konniushennyi bridge.³¹⁴ The impact of this *ukaz* can perhaps be seen in a report from the *Kamer-kontora* to the Senate, which reported a 24,500 rouble loss in profits relating to the sale of alcohol.³¹⁵ The cosmetic element was also addressed in a further *ukaz*, which tried to reduce the number of stalls (*budki*) by

310. *PSZ*, vol. XI, no. 8674 (1 December 1742), p. 728.

311. *PSZ*, vol. XII, no. 9278 (11 April 1746), p. 543.

312. *PSZ*, vol. XIII, no. 10030 (14 October 1752), pp. 707-8.

313. *PSZ*, vol. XV, no. 10904, (11 December 1758), p. 288.

314. *PSZ*, vol. XV, no. 10904, (11 December 1758), p. 289.

315. Smith and Christian, *Bread and Salt*, p. 216.

the turnpikes on the city's main avenues and a specific mention of those selling food and drink (*naruzhnyim s s'estnymi pripasami lavochkam*) on Millionnaia ulitsa, which had to be kept off the street front (*vnutri dvorov*).³¹⁶

Overall, although drinking clearly continued to play an important role in both everyday life and celebrations in Russia for people of all social backgrounds, there was a clear distinction made between its role within the setting of the Court and in the wider 'public' context of St Petersburg, that is to say, something enjoyed by the populace of the city as a whole. This was in part reflected in the development of more refined drinking practices and the provision of non-alcoholic drinks at Court events. The *ukazy* issued during this period on drinking and the location of premises selling alcohol within St Petersburg reflect the State's attempt to control this aspect of 'public' life, in part due to the challenge that the behaviour associated with drinking posed to the maintenance of 'good order' in the city.

Gambling

Gaming and gambling have long been recognised as an important part of the social life of early modern Europe, although they generally developed despite official disapproval during the period.³¹⁷ For example, Henry VIII tried to prohibit playing gambling (with specific mention of cards, dice, bowls and other table games) in 1541, although this proved both unpopular and unenforceable in the long term.³¹⁸ The establishment of gaming and gambling as popular recreations was in part due to their prominence at leading courts across Europe, such as those of James I of England and later Louis XIV of France, and their presence in taverns, coffee-houses and private houses in this period which allowed for players from a variety of social backgrounds.³¹⁹ As regards the eighteenth century, recent scholarship has revolved primarily around the relationship between gambling and literature, in particular the role of Fortune and Fate as themes.³²⁰

This relationship has also been examined in Russia, albeit with reference to a later

316. *PSZ*, vol. XV, no. 11050 (16 April 1760), p. 466.

317. Gerda Reith, *The Age of Chance: Gambling in Western Culture* (London: Routledge, 1999); David S. Parlett, *A History of Card Games* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), pp. 45-60.

318. David Miers, *Regulating Commercial Gambling: Past, Present, and Future* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), p. 21.

319. Miers, *Regulating Commercial Gambling*, pp. 17-18.

320. Thomas M. Kavanagh, *Enlightenment and the Shadows of Chance: The Novel and the Culture of Gambling in Eighteenth-Century France* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993).

period, beginning in the latter stages of the eighteenth century and principally concentrating on gambling during the first half of the nineteenth century.³²¹ Apart from passing mention in the introduction of the above studies, the earlier period has generally been the subject of ‘antiquarian’ collections of anecdotes, which focus on the extravagant nature of gamblers at the Imperial Court, or in broader histories of particular games, most notably chess and cards.³²² Whilst all of the above works include some interesting details, not least about the type of games that were current in Russia during this period, this section will concentrate on the emergence of gaming as a social pastime during the early eighteenth century as part of a wider cultural development in Russia. Although certain games, such as chess, had a long tradition in Russia, increased contact between Muscovy and the rest of Europe from the late sixteenth century onwards meant that other games and gambling practices were introduced to Russia. This included playing cards, draughts (referred to as both *zern* and *shashki*) and other table games.³²³

However, as elsewhere in contemporary Europe, the official attitude was largely hostile - the Orthodox Church distrusted items and pastimes of foreign origin and the wager of money was considered sinful. Legislation, in the form of the *Ulozhenie* (1649), made clear that gambling with cards or dice was associated with thieves (*vory*) and was to be punished in the same way as theft - beating with the knout, removal of the left ear and two years in prison, followed by hard labour.³²⁴ Nevertheless it is clear that such games, although generally confined to the Foreign Quarter in Moscow, were acquired by members of the Muscovite elite for entertainment purposes, although their impact was very limited.³²⁵ In the latter stages of the seventeenth century, a number of factors allowed for the gradual spread of these foreign games. For example, individuals such as Prince Vasili Golitsyn and, more significantly, Peter I himself actively sought to

321. Iurii M. Lotman, *Besedy o russkoi kul'ture: byt i traditsii russkogo dvorianstva (XVIII - nachalo XIX veka)* (St Petersburg: Iskustvo, 2002); Georgii F. Parchevskii, *Karty i kartezhniki* (St Petersburg: Izd. Pushkinskogo fonda, 1998).

322. Mikhail I. Pyliaev, *Staroe zhit'e: ocherki i razskazy* (Moscow: Kniga, 1990), pp. 22-59; Vladimir O. Mikhnevich, 'Istoriia kartochnoi igry na Rusi', *Istoricheskii vestnik*, no. 2 (1901), pp. 583-86; Vladimir P. Zotov, 'Istoriia kartochnoi igry', *Nov'*, vol. 10, nos. 12 and 13 (1886); Isaak M. Linder, *Shakhmaty na Rusi*, 2nd Edition (Moscow: Nauka, 1975).

323. Pyliaev, *Staroe zhit'e*, p. 23.

324. *The Muscovite Law Code (Ulozhenie) of 1649*, ed. by Richard Hellie (Irvine, CA: Charles Schlacks Jr, 1988), 21:15, p. 197.

325. Pyliaev, *Staroe zhit'e*, p. 24.

interact socially with foreigners and this allowed for exposure to this important aspect of European social life. At the same time, the education of young noblemen abroad or by foreign tutors, the increased use of foreign specialists, particularly in the military, and the creation of new social spaces in Russia, all contributed to an increased familiarity with these games.

There was clearly a recognition that such games were an integral part of the social experience, particularly in a city where foreign travellers, merchants and naval personnel were common. For example, in an *ukaz* ordering the establishment of a certain number of hostelries (*gerbergi*) in St Petersburg and on Kronstadt for use by foreign visitors, specific mention was made of the need to provide billiards.³²⁶ The introduction of the *assamblei*, discussed in Chapter One, provided a social forum in which these games could be played. Weber's description of the *assamblei* indicates that there was supposed to be a separate room for playing chess and draughts, and another room for 'parlour games', such as forfeits and cross-purposes.³²⁷ Although the emphasis in both the original *ukaz* and in Weber's account was on social interaction, it was noted by other contemporaries that this was not always possible, albeit for largely practical reasons - smoking, gaming and dancing in close proximity to one another hindered conversation. Peter himself was not keen on gambling, preferring chess or draughts to cards at Court social gatherings, and it was not permitted at the *assamblei* as a result.³²⁸ However, members of both Peter's close circle, such as Menshikov, and Catherine's developing Court were enthusiastic card-players and considerable sums of money were gambled on occasion.³²⁹

With the development of the Court's social life during the 1730s and 1740s, such games, in particular cards, became a prominent feature of an evening of entertainments, such as a *kurtag* or masked ball. It has been suggested that card playing, by its very nature a static pursuit, was favoured by the more mature and hence less energetic members of the Court.³³⁰ This is certainly borne out by the fact that both Anna Ivanovna and Elizabeth increasingly favoured cards as an alternative to dancing at Court events as

326. PSZ, vol. XIII, no. 9737 (13 April 1750), p. 253.

327. Weber, *The Present State of Russia*, vol. 1, p. 188.

328. Bergholz, 'Dnevnik', *Neistovyi reformator*, pp. 338-39.

329. Pyliaev, *Staroe zhit'e*, p. 24.

330. Konstantin A. Pisarenko, *Povsednevnaia zhizn' russkogo dvora v tsarstvovanie Elizavety Petrovny* (Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 2003), pp. 159-60.

their reigns progressed. Although all of the empresses during this period were keen players, this enthusiasm did not always translate into skill at the card table. For example, Manstein noted that Anna tended to lose quite quickly and thus favoured being the banker during games at Court.³³¹ As was the case at other European courts, the fact that the ruler played such games meant that their courtiers were usually obliged to participate, regardless of the financial implications.³³² An *ukaz* dealing with the regulation of gambling amongst the nobility issued in 1761, which will be further discussed below, listed several of the popular card games of this period, which included faro, quintiche, hombre, quadrille, piquet and pamfille.³³³ A number of these games were intended to be played by a small number of people and emphasised skilled play over pure chance, notably quadrille (which involved only four players), thus encouraging an intimate atmosphere in which conversation and other forms of polite interaction could take place.³³⁴ However, the element of risk was much stronger in other card games, particularly faro, in which the odds strongly favoured the banker.³³⁵ Secondly, the very nature of such games meant that it could prove an expensive pastime, even for a member of the elite, and it was the consequences of the demands that this could place on private finances that prompted a series of laws on gambling.³³⁶

A personal *ukaz* issued by Anna Ivanovna in January 1733 dealt with some of the concerns surrounding high-stakes gambling and was to be circulated amongst the people (*v narod*). It began by referring to a previous ban on playing games for money, issued publicly by Peter I in 1717, in which participants were to be fined triple the amount of money wagered in the game. However, the *ukaz* stated that gambling had continued in spite of this prohibition, both in a public and presumably social setting, using the curious phrase *mnogie kompaniami*, and also in private houses (*v partikuliarnykh domakh*). More seriously, from an official point-of-view, gamblers had begun to wager

331. Christoph von Manstein, *Contemporary Memoirs of Russia, from the year 1727 to 1744* (London: Frank Cass, 1968), p. 257.

332. Jerzy Lukowski, *The European Nobility in the Eighteenth Century* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2003), p. 137.

333. *PSZ*, vol. XV, no. 11275 (16 June 1761), p. 731.

334. Miers, *Regulating Commercial Gambling*, pp. 25-26.

335. Miers, *Regulating Commercial Gambling*, p. 23. The banker could exercise a strong influence on proceedings in such games, which goes some way toward explaining Anna Ivanovna's preference for the role, as noted by Manstein (see above reference).

336. For example, Manstein claimed to have seen losses of 20,000 rubles in a single sitting of quinze or faro at Court: Manstein, *Contemporary Memoirs*, p. 257.

not only money and household goods, but also serfs (referred to as *liudi*) and villages whilst playing cards, dice and other games of chance. The *ukaz* makes clear that such gambling will not only bring financial ruin (*krainee ubozhestvo i razorenie*), but also represents a most grave sin (*samyi tiazhkii grekh*), with reference to the example of ‘God’s law’. The fact that the games are described in the *ukaz* as *bogomerzkiia i vreditel’nyiia igry* leaves little doubt about the official attitude toward such activities. Consequently all gambling for money, goods, *dvory* or villages was banned, both in private dwellings and in ‘public houses’ (*v partikuliarnykh i vol’nykh domakh*). The punishments were also listed in the *ukaz*. For a first offence, the precedent of 1717 was followed, with two-thirds of the fine to be given to a hospital (not specified). A second offence was to be punished by a month in prison for officers and other *znatnye liudi*, or a merciless (*neshchadno*) beating with sticks for common people (*podlye liudi*). A third offence involved doubling the monetary value of the fine, and subsequent punishments were left to the discretion of either the Police Chancellery, the local governor or the commanding officer.³³⁷

The prohibitions on gambling were not only intended to apply to the general populace. Specific mention was made of card-playing and billiards in another *ukaz* from the same period, which banned Court pages from establishments (*kabaki* and *vol’nye domy*, both discussed above) where these games took place, although the punishment was still less severe for the pages than for the proprietors.³³⁸ Similarly the *ukaz* of 1717/1733 was reissued in June 1743 and again in March 1747, adding that people of all ranks (*vsiakogo china liudi*) had continued gambling for money in the aforementioned places, despite the restatement of the fines and punishments.³³⁹ A further revision of the law regarding gambling took place in mid-1761, which made clear the distinction between gambling, particularly card-playing, as a vice and as a social activity.

The *ukaz* in question ordered that card games (*azardnyiia v karty*), namely *faro*, *kvintich* and other similar games, were not to be played under any circumstances for money or for goods, except in the Empress’s apartments. Importantly, an exception was

337. *PSZ*, vol. IX, no. 6313 (23 January 1733), p. 20.

338. *PSZ*, vol. IX, no. 6703 (5 March 1735), p. 489.

339. *PSZ*, vol. XII, no. 9380 (11 March 1747), pp. 670-71.

made for a number of other card games, including *hombre*, *quadrille*, *picquet* and *pamphille*, which could be played for very small sums of money in aristocratic houses (*v znatnykh dvorianskikh domakh*). However this was to be only for the purposes of passing the time (*edinstvenno dlia preprovzhdeniia vremeni*), rather than to win something. Anyone playing for larger sums was to be fined twice their annual salary and the amount of money gambled or the value of the pawned goods, and the host (*khoziain*) was to be fined as well. This fine was to be divided in four - one part was given to 'the hospital', a second part was used for the upkeep of the police, and the other two parts was used to reward informers who could provide adequate written proof.³⁴⁰ Any attempt to use promissory notes (*vekseli*) or bills of exchange (*zaemnye kreposti*) in place of money or any kind of pawned goods would result in their confiscation by the Treasury and a fine for those involved. Although the Police Chancellery or local officials were responsible for enforcing this ban, the final point added that the Senate should be informed about any fines, as well as the War College, the Admiralty or the regimental chancelleries for the Guards, since this could have a bearing on rank and promotion.³⁴¹

There are several important points arising from this *ukaz*, which apply to the official attitude toward gambling throughout this period. Firstly, card-playing was clearly perceived as a social pursuit and there were only certain spaces where this was considered appropriate, namely at Court and in the houses of distinguished nobles. Secondly, there was a clear preference for games involving small groups or a high degree of skill, such as *quadrille*, which aided a sociable atmosphere, over those with a high degree of chance, like *faro*, which carried the risk of high losses and debt. Thirdly, the *ukaz* made clear that improper gambling could have a negative effect on one's career, besides the financial implications of any fine imposed. Nevertheless, such games emerged as a social pursuit, and therefore as a forum for interaction, albeit one with defined roles and accepted behaviour, becoming an important part of the urban and particularly elite lifestyle during the first half of the eighteenth century.

In conclusion, the institution of the Police Chancellery had a major impact on 'public' life in St Petersburg. It embodied the desire of the State to regulate many aspects of everyday life, principally in relation to health and safety, in order to maintain 'good

340. *PSZ*, vol. XV, no. 11275 (16 June 1761), p. 731.

341. *PSZ*, vol. XV, no. 11275 (16 June 1761), p. 732

order' in society. However, as the case studies of drinking and gambling have demonstrated, there were continued efforts to restrict the potential for excess in the case of the wider population, whilst tolerating them as part of the social life of the nobility. In part, this reflects a recognition that the more refined atmosphere at Court and in the houses of the nobility imposed its own regulation, with the imposition of fines and losing favour providing a suitable incentive. They also help reflect the development within elite Russian society, with the gradual refinement of the nobility through suitable education resulting in self-regulating tendencies and the concept of appropriate behaviour (which will be discussed in Chapter Five).

Chapter Three - Organising the Public: The Court and its Activities

The first two chapters have discussed the nature and role of the spaces in St Petersburg in relation to 'public' life in the city and the control that the State attempted to impose on it. This chapter examines another major institution, the Russian Court, and its influence on both the 'public' life of the city and its role in supporting the creation of a group within society as an audience or 'public' for its activities. As well as its acknowledged position at the very centre of political decision-making, the Russian Court played a vital role in the development of the social and cultural life of St Petersburg during the first half of the eighteenth century. Despite this, it has long been a subject that has received very little serious scholarly attention.³⁴² In recent years, however, some important work has begun to emerge on the nature of the Russian Court during the reign of Peter I, in particular challenging the widely-held view that he had little time or patience for the elaborate, religious ceremonies which dominated the Muscovite Court.³⁴³ There has also been some tentative research on the emergence of a European-style court under Peter or, more specifically, his wife Catherine and the other empresses who succeeded him during the eighteenth century.³⁴⁴

The image of the 'secular' Court, usually considered in contrast to its predecessor, has been examined in relation to its calendar and the associated ceremonies, both religious and otherwise, with the conclusion that religion continued to play a major role in the public life of the Imperial Russian Court.³⁴⁵ Pisarenko's recent book, based on

342. Leaving aside popular treatments which tend to focus on the lives of the respective rulers or prominent figures at Court, such as the work of Mikhail I. Semevskii, *Tsariitsa Katerina Alekseevna, Anna i Villem Mons, 1692-1724: ocherki iz russkoi istorii XVIII veka* (St Petersburg: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1990), or more recently Nikolai I. Pavlenko, *Strasti u trona: istoriia dvortsovykh perevorotov* (Moscow: Rodina, 1996), the standard starting point remains Nikolai E. Volkov, *Dvor russkikh imperatorov v ego proshlom i nastoiashchem, v 4-kh chastiakh* (St Petersburg: Pechatnia R. Golike, 1900).

343. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, pp. 249-80. For a thought-provoking interpretative study of the Petrine Court and its ribald activities, see Zitser, *The Transfigured Kingdom*, passim.

344. John T. Alexander, 'The Courts of the Russian Empresses in the Eighteenth Century', *The Court Historian*, vol. 4, no. 2 (1999), pp. 141-50; John T. Alexander, 'Catherine I, her Court and Courtiers', in *Peter the Great and the West: New Perspectives*, ed. by Lindsey Hughes (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 227-49.

345. Lindsey Hughes, 'The Petrine Year: Anniversaries and Festivals in the Reign of Peter I (1682-1725)', in *Festival Culture in Germany and Europe from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Century*, ed. by Karin Friedrich (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2000), pp. 149-67; Oksana Iu. Zakharova, *Svetskie tseremonialy v Rossii XVIII-nachala XX v.* (Moscow: Tsentrpoligraf, 2001); Simon Dixon, 'Religious Ceremony at the Eighteenth-Century Russian Court'

extensive archival work, has attempted to reconstruct many aspects of the Court's everyday existence during the reign of Elizabeth. Leaving aside the popular tone of some parts of the text, this has provided a very useful insight into the nature of the Court as an institution and a wealth of details about the wide-ranging scope of Court life.³⁴⁶ In particular, these recent works on the Russian Court have highlighted that its presence in St Petersburg had an influence on the appearance of the city, discussed in Chapter One, and on its wider population, many of whom were linked in some way to the goods and services that the Court required. The fact that the city also staged a number of key Court ceremonies and celebrations mean that it had a major impact on wider 'public' life in the city as well.

In this chapter, I will look at the Court in the first half of the eighteenth century as both a social forum in its own right and a force for cultural change. This can be seen primarily in terms of its direct impact on the nobility, who were active participants in as well as the intended audience for many of the Court's activities. My discussion of the Court will begin by looking at its development as an institution and then examine a number of its 'public' celebrations which took place in St Petersburg. These events were elaborately planned and the decisions taken about the form they took, as well as the elements that they incorporated, often indicate the broader intent of the ruler, using the Court as a stage to project an image or message. As such, given the intent of many of the ceremonies and celebrations to either establish or consolidate the authority of the ruler (discussed in the Introduction), the nobility present at Court can be said to have constituted a 'public' for such events.

It is also important to remember that, in St Petersburg, the nature of such celebrations was affected by the fact that it was still a city under construction. Elaborate or widespread festivities were restricted in the first decade of its existence due to the lack of sufficiently developed areas in which they could be held. As a result, as noted in Chapter One with regard to the nature of the city's 'festive space', many of the major celebrations in early St Petersburg were focussed on certain key areas, most notably Trinity Square during Peter I's reign. This discussion will focus on Court celebrations which occurred in the open, and thus 'public', areas of St Petersburg, rather than

(forthcoming).

346. For further discussion of these points, see my review of Pisarenko in *Study Group on Eighteenth-Century Russia Newsletter*, vol. 32 (2004), pp. 75-78.

‘private’ areas with limited access, such as the Summer Gardens and the palaces of the leading nobility, and which were consciously planned as public spectacles, most notably coronation processions and military victories. Accounts of these celebrations were also made available to a wider audience through commemorative publications, such as coronation albums, and in the regular activities of the Court were made available through short descriptions carried in the *Sanktpeterburgskie Vedomosti*, which will be examined in the last section.

The Court as Institution

An appropriate place to begin is to establish what people and administrative offices constituted the Court as an institution. A useful working model for defining the Court is to consider it in terms of an inner and an outer court. The inner court included not only the rulers and their immediate family, but also their courtiers and Court ladies, who served both as companions and performed certain traditional functions, such as helping them dress, serving them at banquets and fulfilling certain roles during official ceremonies. The outer court consisted of the various offices of the Court administration which, in Muscovite Russia, was headed by the Great Palace *Prikaz*. This was responsible for governing a number of more specialised offices, such as the Imperial Stables and the Estates Chancellery. These bodies employed the large number of retainers required for the practical running of the Court on a daily basis, which included a considerable variety of household servants, from the chamber-pages down to the washerwomen.³⁴⁷ It is worth noting at this point that this outer court structure did not change significantly during the early years of Peter’s reign. However, with the deaths of both Peter’s mother and Ivan V by 1696, and the demands of the Great Northern War from 1700 onwards, the Court administration changed to suit the tsar’s frequent travels and his preference for the practical over the ceremonial. As a result, the Palace Campaign Chancellery was created in St Petersburg in 1704 out of the much larger Great Palace *Prikaz*, which remained based in Moscow.³⁴⁸ The change in emphasis between the two bodies was reflected in the dominance of military ranks and their chief functions. For example, the orderlies (*denshchiki*) and Court couriers (*pridvornye*

347. Pisarenko, *Povsednevnaia zhizn’*, pp. 54-63.

348. Evgenii V. Anisimov, *Gosudarstvennye preobrazovaniia i samoderzhavie Petra Velikogo v pervoi chetverti XVIII veka* (St Peterburg: Dmitrii Bulianin, 1997), p. 144.

kur'ery), who were appointed to organise routine elements relating to the tsar's frequent travels and his various interests, quickly became replacements for the traditional Muscovite elements of the tsar's inner court, the 'table attendants' (*stol'niki*). The men chosen for such positions were often linked to Peter's childhood, such as Matvei D. Olsuf'ev, who went on to become *ober-gofmeister* in 1723.³⁴⁹ This was an important post and will be discussed further below.

Peter had first-hand experience of several other European courts, from both the Grand Embassy (1697-98) and his later visits to Western Europe (1711-12 and 1716-17), principally in a number of German states and France. Alexander notes that the marriage of Aleksei Petrovich to Princess Charlotte of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel in October 1711 meant that her German entourage came to Russia. This coincided with the establishment of new Court posts with German-inspired names, such as the *kamergery*, who were placed under the authority of Catherine, although they had no officially defined duties as yet.³⁵⁰ A list of new Court ranks, displaying a decidedly German influence, was gradually compiled over the next decade, no doubt drawing on the aforementioned travels in 1716-17. This process involved some consultation with the Senate on the issue of the exact rank that these new titles would correspond to, which was eventually enshrined in the Table of Ranks.³⁵¹ However, it is important to note that this was essentially a list of titles and their corresponding ranks. Many of the posts were not filled during either Peter or Catherine I's reigns, despite Menshikov's efforts to form a proper Court staff in 1726, and the duties of most of the Court ranks remained vague.³⁵²

Although the first formal Court staff was appointed under Peter II by his *ober-gofmeister*, Heinrich-Johann Ostermann, it was still very small, with only nineteen courtiers.³⁵³ However, it established the general pattern which was followed by the other rulers in this period, in terms of the number of *kamergery* and *kamer-iunkery*. The major development in the Court as an institution came with the reign of Anna Ivanovna, which saw the introduction of the first regulations for the two major ranks in the

349. Semenova, *Byt i naselenie*, p. 135.

350. Alexander, 'Catherine I', p. 234.

351. Semenova, *Byt i naselenie*, p. 137.

352. Volkov, *Dvor russkikh imperatorov*, p. 3.

353. Volkov, *Dvor russkikh imperatorov*, pp. 19-21.

organisation of the Court: the *ober-gofmeister* and the *ober-gofmarshal*.³⁵⁴ The position of *ober-gofmeister* was very important in this respect, since he was the head of the Court Chancellery and was in charge of the Court's finances. He also dealt with the reception of foreign ambassadors. However, on a practical level, the everyday running of the Court relied more on the figures of the *ober-gofmarshal* and his assistant, the *gofmarshal*. The *ober-gofmarshal* was in charge of the Court Office, which oversaw the various servitors and servants at Court, with the exception of the Court ladies, who were supervised by the *ober-gofmeisterina*. The sheer number of areas that the Court was connected with, including the Imperial palaces and gardens, the stables, the various estates, each of these with their attendant staffs, meant that the number of people involved beyond the ruler and his/her courtiers was considerable.³⁵⁵

The other major development which was introduced during the early years of Anna's reign was that of the Court ranks were filled for the first time.³⁵⁶ The ranks associated with these Court positions gradually grew in numbers over the course of the eighteenth century, perhaps reflecting the growing importance of the Court as a means to distinguish oneself and thereby advance one's career. Under Peter I, *kamer-iunkery* were deemed equivalent to captains and *kamergery* to colonels. Anna Ivanovna raised the rank of both positions in 1737, with *kamer-iunkery* now equivalent to colonels and *kamergery* to majors-general on the Table of Ranks. Elizabeth subsequently raised *kamer-iunkery* to the rank of brigadiers in 1743.³⁵⁷ Despite these developments, it was still clear that the military continued to enjoy the favoured position in elite society that had been established during Peter's reign. An *ukaz* issued in November 1731 ordered that, in the case of equivalent ranks (according to the Table), the military officer was to take precedence over both the civil official and courtier in all 'public' and other meetings (*vo vsiakikh publichnykh i prochikh zasedaniiakh*).³⁵⁸

The higher ranks of the Court included members of many distinguished Russian families, such as the Sheremetevs, Golitsyns and Vorontsovs, who could petition the ruler for a position at Court for their children or relatives, but there were several other

354. These are published in Volkov, *Dvor russkikh imperatorov*, pp. 52-58 and 58-64 respectively.

355. Leonid E. Shepelev, *Chinovnyi mir Rossii: XVIII - nachalo XX v.* (St Petersburg: Iskusstvo-SPB, 1999), pp. 403-4.

356. Volkov, *Dvor russkikh imperatorov*, pp. 22-23.

357. Volkov, *Dvor russkikh imperatorov*, pp. 25-26.

358. *PSZ*, vol. VIII, no. 5877 (13 November 1731), pp. 555-56.

means by which one could enter Court service. During the early stages of the Court's existence, many of its personnel were reassigned from the military. For example, Dmitrii A. Shepelev, who was made *ober-gofmarshal* to Elizabeth in July 1744, began his service in the Guards before being ordered to join Catherine's court in 1710, where he was made *gofmarshal* in 1724. Serving with one of the Guards regiments or becoming a page in the retinue of one of the members of the Imperial family continued to be an important way to access the Court. Rank could be gained either from within the Court itself or by leaving to join the army; from the 1730s onwards, this included education in the Cadet Corps (discussed in Chapter Five).³⁵⁹

Given the authority of the ruler in matters of patronage, it was possible to rise very quickly through the Court ranks if one had the requisite ability or charm. This is usually associated with the favourites of the rulers during this period, with individuals such as Aleksandr Menshikov, Ernst von Biron and Ivan Shuvalov dominating the historiography.³⁶⁰ For example, Vasilii I. Chulkov began as a servant at Court under Anna Ivanovna, but his efficiency apparently caught Elizabeth's eye and she put him in charge of her wardrobe in September 1731, with the rank of *kamerdiner*. The fact that Elizabeth created a new post for him in February 1742, *metr-de-garderob* or *garderobmeister* (deemed of equivalent rank with *kamer-iunker*), highlights his ability to please her in this undoubtedly demanding role, given the Empress's considerable passion for elaborate and expensive clothing.³⁶¹ Interestingly this was followed by his promotion to *kamerger* in September 1751 which, given his humble origins and his very specialised duties may have caused some resentment.³⁶² Despite this resentment, there is evidence to suggest that, with a degree of political ability and awareness of the factions at Court, such favoured individuals could establish themselves and their extended networks in influential positions throughout the administration.³⁶³

359. Pisarenko, *Povsednevnaia zhizn' russkogo dvora*, p. 48.

360. Apart from the popular works noted above in the introduction to this chapter, a reasonable place to start on the role of favourites in this period is John T. Alexander, 'Favourites, Favouritism and Female Rule in Russia, 1725-1796', in *Russia in the Age of Enlightenment: Essays for Isabel de Madariaga*, ed. by Roger Bartlett and Janet Hartley (London: MacMillan, 1990), pp. 106-24.

361. Pisarenko, *Povsednevnaia zhizn' russkogo dvora*, pp. 49-50.

362. Note that Pisarenko believes that Chulkov did not serve as a *kamer-iunker*, which led to the resentment of more established members of the Court: Pisarenko, *Povsednevnaia zhizn' russkogo dvora*, p. 50. However, Volkov lists him as having received this rank on 27 February 1742: Volkov, *Dvor russkikh imperatorov*, p. 172.

363. David L. Ransel, 'Character and Style of Patron-Client Relations in Russia', in *Klientelsysteme im*

As well as the main Court, which was centred around the person of the ruler, this period also saw the emergence of the 'young' Courts, which were associated with the heir to the throne or another prominent member of the ruler's family. Although members of the royal family had traditionally maintained a small personal court on their private estates, such as that of Tsaritsa Praskov'ia Fedorovna at Izmailovo during Peter I's reign, this was largely a personal matter and thus unregulated, frequently with a greater number of 'dependents' than officials.³⁶⁴ However, with the gradual development of the ruler's Court, the situation began to change. A salaried staff of courtiers, including a *kamenger*, four *kamer-iunkery* and two *gof-iunkery*, was appointed by *ukaz* for Peter II's sister, Natal'ia Alekseevna, in December 1727.³⁶⁵ During Anna Ivanovna's reign, Tsarevna Elizaveta Petrovna's court, comprising two *kamerger*y and seven *kamer-iunkery*, was administered and paid by her own office (*kontora*). She was later responsible for appointing the senior posts in the 'young' court of her heir, Peter Fedorovich, and his wife, the future Catherine II, and a series of instructions were drawn up for the other members of this suite.³⁶⁶

The 'young' courts could also represent a potential source of opposition to the main Court. This was particularly clear in the case of Tsarevich Aleksei Petrovich, whose close circle came to be identified by the Petrine administration as a focal point for discontent amongst the more 'reactionary' elements in Russian society.³⁶⁷ Although the extent of any actual conspiracy has been difficult for historians to determine, there is little doubt that the authorities took the situation very seriously, as demonstrated by the subsequent investigations of the Secret Chancellery.³⁶⁸ The evidence from other 'young' courts later in this period, particularly those of the heir to the throne, suggests that they attracted individuals who (tacitly) disagreed with the policies of the main Court. Prominent examples of this tendency were the 'young' courts of Grand Duke Peter

Europa der Fruehen Neuzeit, ed. by Antoni Maczak (Oldenbourg: Munich, 1988), pp. 211-231.

364. Semevskii, *Tsaritsa Praskov'ia*, pp. 27-28.

365. Volkov, *Dvor russkikh imperatorov*, p. 22.

366. These instructions were overseen by Chancellor Aleksandr P. Bestuzhev-Riumin. See *Arkhiv kniazia Vorontsova*, ed. by Petr I. Bartenev (Moscow: Tip. A. I. Mamontova, 1872), vol. II, pp. 98-111.

367. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, pp. 407-11; Iakov A. Gordin, 'Delo tsarevicha Alekseia ili tiazhba o tsene reform', *Zvezda*, no. 11 (1991), pp. 120-43.

368. James Cracraft, 'Opposition to Peter the Great', in *Imperial Russia, 1700-1917: State, Society, Opposition*, ed. by Ezra Mendelsohn and Marshall Schatz (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1988), pp. 22-34.

Fedorovich, whose admiration for Frederick II of Prussia placed him at odds with Elizabeth's foreign policy in the 1750s, and later Grand Duke Paul Petrovich, who was well-known to be critical of his mother's policies.³⁶⁹ The potential for opposition could be reflected in a number of ways, as with the plays performed by tsarevna Elizaveta Petrovna's theatre during the 1730s, the plots of which included the misfortune of a princess denied her rightful inheritance and more general themes like the condemnation of favouritism.³⁷⁰

This period saw the gradual development of a more organised and European-style Court in marked contrast to its Muscovite predecessor. The establishment of new Court ranks and titles was consolidated during Anna Ivanovna's reign. The elements of regulation that have already been discussed with regard to St Petersburg and its inhabitants can be seen in the instructions issued to the senior courtiers at the start of the 1730s and to the members of the 'young' court in the 1740s. Although many of the aspects of the Court continued to reflect the personality and preferences of the ruler, not least in the appointment of personnel and its activities, this was hardly unusual in eighteenth-century Europe and remained the case even during the reign of Catherine II. The next section will look at another important area of development compared to the Muscovite - the 'public' celebrations of the Court.

Public Celebrations

- The Calendar and Regular Celebrations

The Muscovite Court calendar had developed during the sixteenth century and was primarily linked to the Orthodox liturgical year, with due prominence given to the saints days linked to the individual rulers and their relatives, as well as the anniversaries of their coronation and other events of significance, such as the major annual monastic feasts.³⁷¹ For example, the Palm Sunday procession was an important part of the Muscovite Court calendar, noted by several foreign travellers during the seventeenth century.³⁷² The procession was from the Kremlin to one of the chapels within St Basil's

369. My thanks to Ekaterina M. Boltunova for this point, as presented in: 'The Russian Imperial Court in the Eighteenth Century', unpublished paper, BASEES Annual Conference (April 2005).

370. Evgenii V. Anisimov, *Rossii v seredine XVIII veka: bor'ba za nasledie Petra* (Moscow: Mysl', 1986), p. 176.

371. Hughes, 'The Petrine Year', pp. 150-51.

372. See, for example, Olearius, *The Travels of Olearius*, pp. 99-100.

cathedral and reflected the hierarchy at such ceremonial events. It was led by lower-ranking courtiers, followed by a float bearing a fruit tree with boys from the patriarch's choir trying to pick the fruit. The float was followed by parish clergy, higher-ranking courtiers, the tsar and the patriarch, members of the Church hierarchy, and finally distinguished Moscow merchants.³⁷³ Following the liturgy, the procession returned to the Kremlin, echoing Christ's entry into Jerusalem, with the patriarch (representing Jesus) riding a donkey led by the tsar, whilst coloured cloths were laid across their path. Interestingly, the other participants in this ceremonial occasion - in other words, those who observed the processions, waved willow branches (in place of palms) and received the patriarch's blessing - were members of the *strel'tsy* regiments.³⁷⁴ The elevated social position of these participants and the procession's conduct within the enclosed space of the Kremlin, discussed in Chapter One, stressed the restricted nature of access to such events.

The feast days of certain icons, most prominently those which were also associated with a military achievement or linked to the royal family, were also occasions for major court processions. For example, the feast of the icon of Our Lady of Smolensk on 28 July also commemorated the city's salvation from the Poles in 1514 and the foundation of the Novodevich'e monastery in Moscow.³⁷⁵ Although such celebrations reflected the importance of religious ceremony in early modern Russia, there were other significant aspects for the study of both the Court and its role in public life. For example, there was an exemplary element to these celebrations, wherein the ruler participated to lead by example. Although many of these celebrations were largely Court affairs, and as such were restricted to members of the social and religious elite, there were other events that incorporated elements of wider participation or 'public' activity. Amongst the major annual feasts, the blessing of the waters on Epiphany (6 January) was celebrated as a major State event, as well as an important religious occasion. It was traditionally celebrated at the symbolic 'Jordan', by the Moskva river outside the Kremlin, and, although the court was the main focus of proceedings and participated in the procession of the Cross, it also attracted large crowds of faithful

373. Robert Crummey, 'Court Spectacles in Seventeenth-Century Russia: Illusion and Reality', in *Essays in Honour of A. A. Zimin*, ed. by Daniel Clarke Waugh (Columbus, OH: Slavica, 1985), p. 132.

374. Crummey, 'Court Spectacles', p. 136.

375. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 270.

Muscovites, not least to collect the blessed waters after the ceremony had finished.³⁷⁶

Processions with icons and crosses were an important part of the religious calendar, both in the major towns and on a more local level. Such processions were generally tied to the relevant feast-days, although again they could also be used to commemorate other events, such as a military victory or the lifting of a siege, although they were usually given religious significance. The public nature of these events mean that there was generally wider participation, although again there was still a degree of hierarchy and exclusivity. For example, Tsarevna Sophia Alekseevna took part in a public procession of icons with troops before they departed for Kazan' in June 1682. Given its highly visible nature, this was an unusual role for her to play, since elite Muscovite women were rarely seen beyond the *terem* (discussed in the Introduction). Nevertheless it reflected her ambition to play a more prominent role in religious and political life, also shown in her drive to become regent to Peter and Ivan later the same year.³⁷⁷

As part of Peter's reorientation of the calendar of official celebrations, several of the established Church feast-days gained a military character. Religious ceremony and imagery was still a significant part of these events, but the central theme was the secular military power of the monarch and the state as the chief architects of victory, rather than divine providence. For example, it was Peter's reign that saw troops paraded before the blessing of the waters during the feast of the Epiphany on 6 January and the incorporation of the raising of the Russian standard and cannon salutes as part of the celebrations on Easter Sunday.³⁷⁸ Victory celebrations represented a clear blend of religious and secular military elements. Although triumphal parades had occurred in seventeenth-century Russia, such as those to celebrate Prince Vasilii V. Golitsyn's return from the Crimean campaigns in the late 1680s, the victory celebrations for the capture of Azov in 1696 began the process of change noted above, with the introduction of new symbols (like Classical heroes) and a shift in focus to the military strength of the

376. Paul Bushkovitch, 'The Epiphany Ceremony of the Russian Court in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', *Russian Review*, vol. 49, no. 1 (1990), pp. 1-18.

377. Lindsey Hughes, *Sophia, Regent of Russia, 1657-1704* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990), p. 74.

378. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 274 and Chudinova, 'Audio-Spatial Aspect', pp. 62-63.

state, rather than simply the grace of God.³⁷⁹

The celebrations in St Petersburg for the major victories of the Great Northern War reflect this trend. For example, to commemorate the defeat of Charles XII at Poltava, which had already been celebrated in Moscow in December 1709, celebrations in St Petersburg took place in June 1710, beginning with a church service, followed by cannon salutes from both fortresses and ships on the Neva. Later in the day there was a regatta of these ships and a fireworks display, with a banquet in the evening.³⁸⁰ The Russian naval victory at Hangö was celebrated in St Petersburg in September 1714 with a flotilla of captured Swedish vessels sailing down the Neva, followed by a parade with Swedish prisoners-of-war across to the Church of the Holy Trinity where a religious service was held.³⁸¹ The signing of the Peace of Nystadt with Sweden in August 1721 led to impromptu celebrations in St Petersburg. A church service in Sts Peter and Paul cathedral was followed by cannon salutes, with beer and wine subsequently distributed amongst the people of the city.³⁸² Because of their significance in Peter's acceptance of the title *imperator*, the formal celebrations, which began on 22 October, have been well-documented, by both contemporaries, such as Bergholz, and historians. A service in the Sts Peter and Paul cathedral was followed by cannon salutes from the fortress and 125 ships on the Neva, along with musket volleys from assembled regiments. In the evening, there was a banquet for 1000 dignitaries in the Senate house, and a large-scale fireworks display, with the city illuminated at night.³⁸³

Victory celebrations, particularly commemorating the major achievements of the Great Northern War like Poltava, continued to be an important element in the calendar under Peter's successors. This was reflected in an *ukaz* issued by Anna Ivanovna in 1735, which established the number of such celebrations per year.³⁸⁴ They represented an element which, unlike the more traditional Orthodox feasts, was not present in the Muscovite calendar and which continued to remind the population of the military

379. Elena Pogolian, *Petr I - arkhitektori rossiiskoi istorii* (St Petersburg: Iskusstvo-SPB, 2001), pp. 29-41.

380. Just Juel, 'Zapiski datskogo poslannika v Rossii pri Petre Velikom', in *Lavry Poltavy*, ed. by Viktor Naumov (St Petersburg: Fond Sergeia Dubova, 2001), pp. 188-89.

381. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 272. For a brief description of events, see Weber, *The Present State of Russia*, vol. 1, pp. 35-40.

382. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 273.

383. For a detailed description, see Bergholz, 'Dnevnik', *Neistovyi reformator*, pp. 225-32.

384. *PSZ*, vol. IX, no. 6832 (29 October 1735).

achievements of the State. In the following sections, the focus will be on the more irregular, one-off celebrations for the major events of the Court, although in several cases, there were also celebrations for the anniversaries of these events.

- Coronations

Although many of the official coronation celebrations took place in Moscow, where the ceremony itself continued to take place in the eighteenth century, the return of the newly-crowned ruler with the Court to St Petersburg was an occasion for elaborate celebrations. This had first occurred in 1732 following Anna Ivanovna's return from her coronation in Moscow, when a procession had been organised along Nevskii prospekt through the city's triumphal arches to the Winter Palace.³⁸⁵ However, although this was a planned procession, which made use of one of the key arterial routes in the city's space, it was largely confined to the members of the elite, riding in carriages, and the troops stationed in the city, who lined the route. On the other hand, Elizabeth's ceremonial entry to St Petersburg following her coronation in Moscow in 1742 was a larger and more 'public' procession. Although it followed largely the same route, along Nevskii prospekt, the procession was divided into four main stages, making use of the major architectural features on the route to allow different social groups to participate in the occasion. There is also more information regarding the planning of this procession and the other celebrations which followed it.

Beginning with the first triumphal arch on Nevskii prospekt, by the aforementioned Anichkov bridge, the regiments garrisoned in St Petersburg, most prominently the Guards, were drawn up in parade formation along the side of the road. As the Empress's cortege approached (at a distance of approximately thirty yards), the musicians of these regiments began to play until she had passed, thus creating a wave of music following her progress. Further along, at the main *gostinyi dvor*, the city's merchants were drawn up in two lines, divided into those of Russian origin on the right-hand side and foreigners on the left-hand side of the road. At the Church of Our Lady of Kazan, members of the clergy were assembled with seminarians on elevated platforms on either side of the prospekt singing a specially-composed hymn of praise to the

385. Burkhard von Münnich, 'Dispozitsiia i tseremoniial torzhestvennogo v''ezda imperatritsy Anny Ivanovny v S.-Peterburg 16 genvaria 1732', comp. by M. D. Khmyrov, *Russkii arkhiv*, vol. 2 (1867), pp. 332-41.

Empress. At the second triumphal arch, by the 'Green' bridge over the Moika river, Ranks 6-8 of the State administration were assembled, with musicians from the Admiralty and the Naval Academy continuing the musical accompaniment to the procession. Finally the top six ranks of the administration and members of the Court were gathered in front of the Winter Palace.

As the Empress arrived at this point, there was a signal and a musket volley began from the troops lining Nevskii prospekt, creating a rolling wave of fire along the procession route. This was augmented by cannon fire from regimental guns at each of the four stages, joined by the Admiralty and the Sts Peter and Paul fortress (with the latter firing one more gun than the former). Church bells were rung continuously during this procession. Each group were dressed in their full uniforms, with the merchantry required to dress in colours determined by their status (wealth and nationality). The city, and in particular the triumphal gates, were illuminated at night for the following eight days.³⁸⁶ This procession was clearly intended to be a 'public' celebration of the ruler's return to the capital city. The planning process explicitly incorporated the various important social groups within the city's inhabitants to greet the ruler at different stages and therefore demonstrate their loyalty. The illumination of the city at night, as well as the large volume of gunfire, ensured that the city's wider population were made aware of proceedings as well.

- Weddings

The weddings of members of the Imperial family provided an important opportunity for the Court to demonstrate not only its wealth and happiness, but particularly from the reign of Peter I onwards, its position within a wider European context both to its own members, to the diplomatic community and, in some cases, a wider audience. For example, the wedding of the Court jester, Filat Shanskii, in 1702, highlighted in typically Petrine fashion the transition that Russia was undergoing. The first two days were conducted in the traditional Orthodox manner, with Muscovite clothing and male/female segregation, whereas guests on the final day of the wedding celebrations wore 'German dress' and mixed freely with one another.³⁸⁷ A similar contrast was made during the 'mock' wedding of P. I. Buturlin, a prominent member of the All-Drunken

386. *RGIA*, f. 282, op. 1, d. 5, l. 282.

387. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, pp. 260-61.

Assembly, in June 1712, at which Peter ordered the guests to wear traditional Muscovite robes and the celebrations included sailing to Peterhof in an old Russian boat, which was clearly unsuitable for the task.³⁸⁸

The first major Court wedding in St Petersburg was that of Anna Ivanovna and Friedrich Wilhelm, Duke of Courland, in October 1710, which was celebrated in a European fashion with a major banquet at Aleksandr Menshikov's house on Vasil'evskii island.³⁸⁹ This was echoed in the celebrations for Peter's second wedding, to his consort Catherine (very definitely not of royal lineage), in February 1712, which were conducted publicly in a European fashion, with a decidedly naval theme - for example, Peter wore a rear-admiral's uniform. There was a short, private church ceremony in the morning, and a banquet in the newly-built Winter Palace in the evening with Menshikov as the marshal, depicted in an engraving by Aleksei Zubov, followed by rockets and illuminations that night.³⁹⁰ This established the pattern for royal weddings for the remainder of this period, virtually all of which took place in St Petersburg, rather than Moscow, indicating Russia's closer ties with Europe in a similar manner to the links created by the marriages themselves.

Accounts survive for most of the main Imperial weddings in the first half of the eighteenth century, either from foreign visitors or diplomats, such as Juel's description of Anna Ivanovna's wedding or Lady Rondeau's description of Anna Leopoldovna's wedding to the Duke of Brunswick in 1737, or official published descriptions, as in the case of Anna Petrovna's wedding to the Duke of Holstein in 1725 (referred to below).³⁹¹ However, in order to reflect the importance attached to weddings as a public spectacle for both a Russian audience and foreign observers, I have chosen to concentrate on the wedding of Grand Duke Peter Fedorovich to his German fiancée, Princess Sophie of

388. Zitser, *The Transfigured Kingdom*, pp. 122-24.

389. Ol'ga G. Ageeva, 'Novye iavleniia v obshchestvennoi zhizni i bytu Peterburga pervoi chetverti XVIII v.: na primere tsarskikh svadeb', in *Russkaia kul'tura v perekhodnyi period ot srednevekov'ia k novomu vremeni: sbornik statei*, ed. by A. N. Kopylov, Ol'ga G. Ageeva and Lev N. Pushkarev (Moscow: IRI RAN, 1992), pp. 89-103.

390. Lindsey Hughes, 'Peter the Great's Two Weddings: Changing Images of Women in a Transitional Age', in *Women in Russia and Ukraine*, ed. by R. Marsh (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 36-40.

391. Juel, 'Zapiski', *Lavry Poltavy*, pp. 215-20; Mrs. William Vigor, *Letters from a Lady, Who Resided Some Years in Russia, to her Friend in England. With Historical Notes* (London: J. Dodsley, 1775), pp. 189-207; *Opisanie o brake mezhu Eia Vysochestvom Annoiu Petrovnoi, Tsesarevnoi Vserossiikoii, i Ego Korolevskim Vysochestvom Karlom Fridrikhom, Gertsogom Golshteinogottorpskim* (St Petersburg, 1725).

Anhalt-Zerbst, the future Catherine II. There were few royal weddings between the death of Peter I in 1725 and Elizabeth in 1761, so this was a major event, and we are particularly well-informed about it through the notes of the Court *Ober-Tseremoniimeister*, Count Santi. These give an important insight on the preparation process that is not available for the earlier weddings.

Planning for the wedding of the Grand Duke probably began in earnest after his fiancée's conversion to Orthodoxy, when she took the name Ekaterina Alekseevna, in Moscow on 28 June 1744. Catherine herself wrote in her *Mémoires* that, by the spring of 1745, the preparations had already begun.³⁹² Count Santi and Fedor Veselovskii, the Court *Tseremoniimeister*, held a meeting on the subject with Count Aleksei Bestuzhev-Riumin at his house at 6pm on 26 February. The Empress had ordered that the wedding should be based on that of Grand Duchess Anna (the Empress's sister and Grand Duke Peter's mother) to the Duke of Holstein-Gottorp, which took place in May 1725.³⁹³ Santi wrote to the *Gofmarshal* Dmitrii Shepelev to ask for the records for the occasion from the Court office - the French word in the original text was *comptoir*, indicating the exchequer, although it could have been an attempt to render the Russian *kontora* - but Shepelev informed him that this did not exist at the time. Santi therefore was obliged to consult recollections of events (*des traditions orales*) and devise a new plan, which was to take account of changes which had occurred in the intervening years.³⁹⁴ This plan was to have irrefutable foundations (*fondé sur des preuves irréfragables*) and was subject to review by the College of Foreign Affairs.³⁹⁵

The resulting plan, submitted to the College on 4 March and then examined on 22 March, raised fourteen 'points' or questions that needed further input from the Empress. These included clarification on whether the Empress would travel alone in her carriage or with Peter and Catherine, and if she did not, then whether they would be accompanied by Prince August, Duke of Hesse-Homburg, and Catherine's mother respectively. The nature of the travelling arrangements also raised the question of the

392. *Memoirs of Catherine the Great*, ed. by Katherine Anthony (London: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927) [hereafter *Memoirs* (tr. Anthony)], p. 64.

393. Note that the transcription of these notes in the mid-nineteenth century mistakenly dates Anna Petrovna's wedding to 1726, despite the existence of evidence to the contrary.

394. Again, this seems an odd comment, given the fact that an account of the wedding had been published by the Academy of Sciences (see above).

395. *RGIA*, f. 473, op. 3, d. 15, ll. 2-2ob (1745).

order of the carriages in which the Imperial family would travel, especially in relation to the Empress.³⁹⁶ Similarly, a later point dealt with the seating arrangements for the Imperial family at the banquet on the first day of celebrations, in particular where Catherine's mother and Prince August should be. Santi suggested that they might be placed at a separate table, either opposite the throne or to the left of it, using the example of the seating for the coronation of Catherine I and referring to the glorious memory of Elizabeth's father.³⁹⁷

On a practical level, the seventh point stressed the importance of choosing the church soon in order to begin preparations for the seating of the Imperial family and the various dignitaries, such as ambassadors, foreign ministers and members of the Court. This point also noted that, to avoid any confusion or overcrowding, precautions should be taken to ensure that only the requisite number of dignitaries (*le nombre et qualité des personnes*) should be allowed into the church. A note in the margins added that the example of other European courts indicated that such weddings usually took place in the churches used by the ruler.³⁹⁸ The wedding was to be announced by two heralds (*deux héraux*) for three days prior to the event in all public places (*dans toutes les places publiques*), accompanied by trumpets and drums. This had not been considered practical for Grand Duchess Anna's wedding, although no explanation was provided for this. An entry in the margin of the above point mentioned that this had been extensively debated by the College of Foreign Affairs and, although Santi was unable to recall a previous example of such an announcement in Russia, it was considered necessary in view of the number of ambassadors and foreign ministers who would be present.³⁹⁹ Another point relating to the commemoration of the event is mentioned in the twelfth point, which raised the possibility of having a medal struck for the occasion, in which case the Academy of Sciences would have to be informed in time to have an emblem designed.⁴⁰⁰

In both cases, it is the perception of the events by others, in particular by foreigners, that is foremost in Santi's mind and it is telling that the 'points' made

396. *RGIA*, f. 473, op. 3, d. 15, ll. 3-3ob (1745).

397. *RGIA*, f. 473, op. 3, d. 15, l. 5ob (1745).

398. *RGIA*, f. 473, op. 3, d. 15, ll. 3ob-4 (1745).

399. *RGIA*, f. 473, op. 3, d. 15, l. 4 (1745).

400. *RGIA*, f. 473, op. 3, d. 15, l. 5 (1745).

specific reference to the practice of other European courts in several places. For example, in the ninth ‘point’, on the question of who should carry the trains of the Empress and Grand Duchess, it was pointed out that, in the principal courts of Europe, this role was performed by Court ladies.⁴⁰¹ More explicitly, the final ‘point’ noted that the custom observed at Anna’s wedding, of the bride receiving congratulations from guests and presenting them with a glass of wine whilst seated under a canopy (*une sous coupé*), was considered ‘Oriental’ or suitable only for ‘middling’ people. As Santi himself put it,

*Cet usage, si ancien, conservé tout au plus parmi les orientaux ou le moyen peuple en Europe, est tellement opposé au bel usage dans les cours des Souverains.*⁴⁰²

The example of Anna’s wedding was raised again in the tenth point to discuss the need for servants to ensure that the carriages of private individuals should not be allowed to interfere in the procession. The following point also dealt with the carriages for this procession, with regard to the rank of the people involved. Questions are raised about the use of six horses, if a second carriage should be provided by a noble for his wife, the need for gold and silver ornamentation on both carriage and livery, and if the number of servants should be fixed. This point also highlighted the need to inform these people in sufficient time to make the necessary preparations, something that was addressed by the *ukaz* discussed below.⁴⁰³

Two decrees issued on 16 March relate to the discussion in the document above and concern the appearance of the distinguished guests and their mode of transport for the wedding celebrations. In the first decree, from the Empress to the Senate, there is an order to provide a monetary grant (*zhalovan’e*) to members of the first four Ranks (also referred to as *znatnye persony*) and Court gentlemen (*kavalery*) in order to ensure that their equipage was in a suitable condition for the occasion (*po pristoinosti*).⁴⁰⁴ The second decree required the Senate and the distinguished ranks (*znatnye chiny*) of the Empire to begin their preparations for the wedding ceremony and celebrations in the early days of July. The first four Ranks and the Court gentlemen were allowed to use

401. *RGIA*, f. 473, op. 3, d. 15, l. 4ob (1745).

402. *RGIA*, f. 473, op. 3, d. 15, ll. 5ob-6 (1745).

403. *RGIA*, f. 473, op. 3, d. 15, ll. 4ob-5 (1745).

404. *PSZ*, vol. XII, no. 9123 (16 March 1745), p. 346.

gold and silver ornamentation (*ubranstvo*) in their clothing and their equipage according to their means (*po vozmozhnosti*).⁴⁰⁵ In addition, given that the celebrations were to take place over a number of days, each person (with specific mention of both men and women) should have at least one new set of clothing made, although those who wanted to could make more. With regard to the points raised by Santi's plan, it was stipulated that each person should have a carriage, with those who could afford it also providing one for their wives. The decree goes on to list details of how many servants they could have. For example, members of the top two Ranks could have a considerable entourage: for each carriage, they could have two *gaiduki*, between eight to twelve *lakei* (but certainly no fewer than eight), two *skorokhody*, one or two pages, and up to two *egery*.⁴⁰⁶ Finally, the strictures on the suitability of dress and equipage, mentioned above in relation to the *Generalitet*, were also applicable for members of the fifth and sixth Ranks, who were not taking part in the ceremonial procession, but who would be participating in the wider celebrations.

The concern for the appearance of the participants in the ceremonial procession and in the wedding celebrations in general shown in the documents above was very much a reflection of both the wealth and status of the Russian elite. Although it clearly disregards the *ukaz* on the need for moderation in one's dress, which had been issued only two years previously (see Chapter Five), it is equally clear that the occasion was considered sufficiently important to merit such an exception. The need for things to go smoothly continued to be reflected in the build-up to the wedding. For example, this excerpt from the *Sanktpeterburgskie Vedomosti* on 9 August 1745, following on from a brief mention of the celebrations for the feast-day of the Preobrazhenskii Guards regiment, relates to the preparations discussed above:

Пред несколько днями из Правительствующаго Сената объявлен ЕИВа указ, чтоб по силе преждевыданнаго ЕИВа Марта 16 дня сего 1745 года указу, для торжественнаго брака Его Императорскаго Высочества Государя Великаго Князя и Государыни Великой Княжны, платье экипажи и прочее у всех подлежащих к тому чинов были в готовности конечно сего Августа к 19 числу.⁴⁰⁷

405. *PSZ*, vol. XII, no. 9124 (16 March 1745), pp. 346-47.

406. *PSZ*, vol. XII, no. 9124 (16 March 1745), p. 347.

407. *StPb Ved.*, no. 63 (Friday, 9 August 1745), p. 543.

Similarly, in the week preceding the wedding, specifically on 14 and 16 August, there were masquerade balls incorporating rehearsals of the dance quadrilles which were to play a central role in the week of celebrations for the occasion.⁴⁰⁸ It is surprising that several of the plans and projects for the wedding celebrations suggest that the ceremony was originally set for 18 August, even though the official journal kept of the event by the Court *kamer-fur'ery* unambiguously states that it took place on 21 August.⁴⁰⁹ Catherine's *Mémoires* noted that the date was fixed for 21 August after the preparations had been mostly completed, although given that 18 August was a Sunday, it is difficult to explain why the decision was taken to delay the wedding ceremony.⁴¹⁰

In preparation for the wedding, and at the Empress's request, Peter and Catherine attended confession and took communion in the Church of the Holy Mother of Kazan', where the ceremony was to take place, on 15 August and heard Vespers at the St Aleksandr Nevskii monastery on 17 August.⁴¹¹ On the day itself, a five-gun salute from the St Peter and Paul fortress at 6am was the signal for members of the first four Ranks to gather at the new (i.e. wooden) Winter Palace at 6am. At 11am, a twenty-one-gun salute from the Admiralty signalled the start of a carriage procession to the Church of the Holy Mother of Kazan'. This procession involved the Imperial family, members of their respective courts and the *Generalitet*, foreign ministers, and their respective wives. A few points are worth noting about this procession. Firstly, it provides a very useful list of the members of the *Generalitet* who were present in St Petersburg for the occasion, many of whom are often not recorded by name in relation to other Court celebrations. Secondly, the order in which they travelled gives us some indication as to their rank and their relationship with the Empress. Unsurprisingly, the closest people to the Empress, aside from Peter and Catherine who were in her carriage, were her inner Court (i.e. *kamergery*, *kamer-iunkery* and Court ladies) and the members of the Life Company. Interestingly, with the exception of the Court ladies, all of the other female

408. *KFZh*, 1745 (14 and 16 August), p. 50.

409. For example, in the notes made by Count Santi, discussed above, the date of the wedding is given as 18 August (*le mariage de les Altesses Impériales s'effectua le 18 d'août 1745*) - *RGIA*, f. 473, op. 3, d. 15, l. 13 (1745). Also, in a description of the planned celebrations for the wedding by Count Rastrelli, a footnote gave the date of the wedding as 18 August - *RGIA*, f. 473, op. 3, d. 14, l. 2 (1745).

410. *The Memoirs of Catherine the Great*, transl. by Mark Cruse and Hilde Hoogenboom (New York: Modern Library, 2005) [hereafter *Memoirs* (tr. Cruse and Hoogenboom)], p. 31.

411. *Memoirs* (tr. Anthony), p. 67 and *KFZh*, 1745 (17 August), p. 51.

participants were in carriages following behind that of the Empress, whereas the male participants all travelled in front of her, either in carriages or on horseback.

Following the church ceremony, the assembled regiments fired three volleys in conjunction to cannon salutes from twenty-four galleys, two transports and two yachts on the Neva river. The procession then returned to the Winter Palace for the wedding banquet, spread across the gallery and four other rooms. There were a number of toasts to both the Empress and the newly-weds, accompanied by cannon salutes from both fortresses (fifty-one guns for the happy couple, one hundred and one guns for the Empress).⁴¹² Afterwards there was a ball until 11.45pm, whereupon the 'happy' couple were led away to their newly-prepared rooms: Catherine's *Mémoires* make clear that this was when the consummation of the marriage was intended to take place.⁴¹³ There are more details included for the festivities the following evening. There was a ball at 9pm that evening in the gallery of the Winter Palace, to which the first four Ranks and foreign ministers were invited, followed by a banquet in the hall at 1am. Details are given in the official Court account about the setting - a large (*figurnyi*) table had been prepared, which incorporated fountains, cascades and pyramids of candles, and the upper windows were also illuminated, so that 10,000 candles were used in total. Seating at this table was controlled by ticket and there were 130 guests from the Court ranks, foreign ministers and the members of the first four Ranks. The meal was accompanied by Italian music played from the balcony of the hall. Interestingly, the Empress did not dine at this table, but in a side room with spiritual dignitaries and other select guests (thirty-five people in total), though their names were not included.⁴¹⁴

The next major event to celebrate the wedding occurred on 25 August, with the performance of the opera *Scipio* in the Opera house near the Summer Palace. This was attended by the Empress, the Grand Duke, the Grand Duchess and her mother, and Prince August, as well as an unspecified number of distinguished guests. It appears that the libretto was produced in Russian, French and Italian in a lavish edition (*v raznykh bogato ukrashennykh opravakh*) which was distributed to these guests.⁴¹⁵ However, the centrepiece of the Court celebrations occurred on 26 August, in the form of the masked

412. *ZhDA*, 1745 (21 August), p. 35.

413. *Memoirs* (tr. Anthony), p. 70.

414. *KFZh*, 1745 (22 August), pp. 69-70.

415. *KFZh*, 1745 (25 August), p. 75.

danced quadrilles, which had been rehearsed earlier in the month. This formed part of a ball held in the Winter Palace at 7pm. There were four quadrilles, each with seventeen pairs, meaning a total of 136 people. Again, as with the seating at the banquet discussed above, partners were decided by tickets. The quadrilles were led by the Grand Duke, the Grand Duchess, her mother and Prince August; each group had its own colours - the Grand Duke's were rose and silver, his wife's white and gold, her mother's light blue and silver, and Prince August's were pale yellow and silver.⁴¹⁶ There was a banquet after the ball, with seating by number, with each quadrille sitting in a row. The Empress instead went to dine with Count Aleksei Razumovskii at his house by the old Winter Palace, with forty other guests.⁴¹⁷

The impression that this description gives us is of a colourful and well-organised dance spectacle, another reflection of the Court's grandeur, yet it is interesting to note that ambassadors and foreign ministers were not invited to the ball. No reason for this omission was given in the official account of the celebrations.⁴¹⁸ Catherine's description of the occasion in her *Mémoires* calls into question the impact of the masked ball as a spectacle, but her memory had evidently been affected either by the unhappy nature of events or the passage of time. For example, although she correctly remembered her dance partner of the evening, Count Lascy, she complained that none of the gentlemen present were capable of dancing and that they were all aged between sixty and ninety.⁴¹⁹ This hardly seems flattering to Prince Nikita Trubetskoi (aged 48), Vice-Chancellor Count Mikhail Vorontsov or Petr Shuvalov (both aged 35), to name a few examples, who were actually members of her own quadrille.⁴²⁰ Catherine continued:

Never in my life had I seen a more woeful and stupid amusement than were these quadrilles. In one enormous hall only forty-eight couples were dancing, and among whom were numerous lame, gouty, and decrepit figures; all the rest were spectators in ordinary dress and did not dare mingle with the quadrille dancers. The Empress however considered it so lovely that she had it repeated all over again.⁴²¹

416. *KFZh*, 1745 (26 August), pp. 76-80.

417. *KFZh*, 1745 (26 August), p. 81.

418. *KFZh*, 1745 (26 August), p. 80.

419. *Memoirs* (tr. Anthony), p. 91.

420. *RGADA*, f. 16, op. 1, d. 443, ll. 177 and 178-178ob (1747).

421. *Memoirs* (tr. Anthony), p. 91.

It should be noted that the ‘ordinary dress’ mentioned here is simply clothing not in the colours of the quadrilles - the legislation discussed above ensured that guests dressed in a suitably opulent manner. No doubt Catherine’s description was accurate in several cases, given the age and health of some of the participants, but equally her own memories of the celebrations may not have been entirely free of the ambivalence she felt toward her marriage.

Other weddings from a similar period also reflect the seriousness with which such celebrations were taken at Court. For example, on the evening of 14 February 1748, two major weddings were celebrated simultaneously at Court: Count Andrei M. Efimovskii married the Empress’s *freilina* Iaguzhinskaia, and *kamenger* Aleksandr M. Golitsyn married Grand Duchess Catherine’s *freilina* Gagarina. The significance of proceedings was reflected in the Court personnel who organised and participated in proceedings. For example, the marshal for Efimovskii’s wedding was the General-Procurator Prince Nikita Trubetskoi, whilst the wedding processions included both the Grand Duke and Duchess, Count Aleksei P. Bestuzhev-Riumin, Count Aleksandr I. Rumiantsev, *obergofmeister* von Münnich and Aleksandr B. Buturlin.⁴²² The journal entry notes that there were sixty guests at each of the wedding banquets, which were held in two separate rooms, with a third room containing a further thirty places for women from both weddings.⁴²³ This banquet involved the usual round of toasts for the newly-weds and their families, followed by dancing in the gallery. On the following evening, the traditional second day of celebrations for the weddings, the Empress was a guest at the banquet for the Efimovskii wedding, again followed by dancing.⁴²⁴

The issue of attendance at these events was raised in an order from the Empress to which a report by *politseimeister* Aleksei Tatishchev on 17th February responded. The preamble to the report explains that Tatishchev had compiled a register of women who failed to attend the wedding celebrations on 15th February, as well as other balls and similar events, despite being ‘allowed’ to, i.e. expected to.⁴²⁵ The register consists of the names of the women along with the excuses for their absence. This list of names

422. *KFZh*, 1748 (14 February), pp. 16-17.

423. Interestingly it is noted that these women are not able to move (*umestit’sia ne mogli*) from this room, although no explanation is given for this: *KFZh*, 1748 (14 February), pp. 17-18.

424. *KFZh*, 1748 (15 February), pp. 18-19.

425. *RGADA*, f. 14, op. 1, d. 110, ll. 1-1ob (17 February 1748).

consists of the wives and daughters of high-ranking officials, such as the daughter of Vice-Admiral Golovin, the wife of Prince Meshcherskii, *ober-komendant* of St Petersburg, and the wife of *ober-tseremoniimeister* Count Santi. Illness appears to have been primarily responsible for their absence. For example, the wife of *kamenger* Prince Petr M. Golitsyn explained that she was present on 14 February, but was ill on the following day, for which she sought help from Condoidi, one of the Court doctors. Only one entry gives any particular detail, with the note that State Counsellor Brevern's wife had been suffering from a headache (*byla istogo vremeni zaglavnoi bolezniu*). Similarly there is also only one case of an illness in the family - Colonel Rumiantsev's wife has to look after her mother and her siblings. Interestingly, of the sixteen women mentioned, six were unable to attend only the second day of the wedding celebrations.⁴²⁶

The requirement to attend such events can also be seen in an order issued by Elizabeth concerning several weddings and public masquerades at Court in the weeks preceding Shrovetide - the year is not given on the document, but other sources indicate that it relates to 1756. The weddings in question are those of *stats-dama* Mar'ia Simonovna [Chogloкова] and *freilina* [Mar'ia Aleksandrovna] Naryshkina, though it does not mention the intended spouses - *ober-prokuror* Aleksandr I. Glebov and Grand Duke Peter's *kamer-iunker* Mikhail M. Izmailov, respectively. The dates for the weddings are included (7-8 and 12-13 February), but the *rospisanie* ends without providing any more details.⁴²⁷ From the *Kamer-fur'erskii zhurnal*, we learn that the guests were the first four Ranks of the *Generalitet* and foreigners, presumably meaning ambassadors and other diplomatic dignitaries, who were summoned to Court on the evening of 7 February by means of *shafery*.⁴²⁸

Overall, weddings, with their theme of happiness, were ideal occasions on which to bring together monarch, happy couple and Court and to display to the foreign community Russia's growing prominence and eligibility as a partner, as well as the improved manners of its 'public'. The insights provided by the details of the planning process make the wedding of Grand Duke Peter Fedorovich an important Court event to study in this respect. Santi's notes make clear that the intention is create an elaborate

426. *RGADA*, f. 14, op. 1, d. 110, l. 2ob (17 February 1748).

427. *RGADA*, f. 14, op. 1, d. 199, ll. 1-1ob (n.d.)

428. *KFZh*, 1756 (7-8 February 1756), pp. 10-13 and (14-15 February 1756), pp. 16-20.

spectacle, both for the guests and for a wider audience, both within Russia and beyond. This was reflected in the appearance of the guests, which was governed by the stipulations on dress, equipage and number of servants. Similarly, the guest list and particularly the order of the procession from the Winter Palace to the church were an indication of social hierarchy and provide some important details on the composition of the Court elite.

- Funerals

The death of the ruler or a member of their family provide another example of a Court ceremony in which there was a conscious change in emphasis from the established Muscovite traditions during the early eighteenth century. The increasing shift in focus from Moscow to St Petersburg which can be seen in relation to several major elements within the Court calendar, as discussed above, was also reflected in the funerary arrangements for the Imperial family in this period. However, there were also important developments in the organisation and accessibility of the funeral's various elements which appear to take account of contemporary European practices. The funeral of Peter I, in March 1725, stood in stark contrast to the traditional funerals of his father and half-brothers, in January 1676, April 1682 and January 1696 respectively. It also provided a model for the conduct of the Imperial funerals and established the Sts Peter and Paul Cathedral in St Petersburg as the main burial place for the Romanovs until the fall of the dynasty in 1917.⁴²⁹

Muscovite funerals were conducted entirely within the walls of the Kremlin, with the burial taking place in the Cathedral of the Archangel Michael, a short distance from the royal palace. Muscovite funeral processions were exclusively religious affairs, within the enclosed space of the Kremlin, and only involved members of the Church and Court hierarchy. The funeral ceremony generally took place within two days of death, after which groups of courtiers and members of the clergy maintained a vigil by the tomb of the deceased around the clock for forty days, in accordance with Orthodox tradition.⁴³⁰ By contrast, Peter's funeral was always intended to take place in his new city and required a considerable period of preparation. His corpse was embalmed, a foreign technique and one which proved controversial with the Orthodox Church, and

429. Lindsey Hughes, 'The Funerals of the Russian Emperors and Empresses', (forthcoming).

430. Lindsey Hughes, 'The Funerals of the Russian Emperors and Empresses', (forthcoming).

then lay in state for a period prior to the funeral procession in a specially-designed ‘chamber of mourning’ (*castrum doloris*) in the large hall of the Winter Palace. The coffin was surrounded by symbols of military and imperial power, and the room was decorated with allegorical sculptures, featuring grieving Classical figures and representations of Peter’s virtues. This also proved unpopular with the Church hierarchy, who believed such symbols were ‘pagan’. A vigil was kept by groups of senators and soldiers, with a priest reading from the psalms and the gospels.⁴³¹

Importantly, this *castrum doloris* was also open to a wider ‘public’, with the coffin raised up to allow access for mourning by the large crowds of people (*velikoi tesnoty ot naroda*).⁴³² Some indication of the public nature of mourning was given in another contemporary source on the death of Peter, attributed to Feofan Prokopovich, which described, albeit with a degree of rhetorical licence, how people of all ranks and ages came to kiss the late tsar’s hand and wept.⁴³³ The other major public element of the funeral was the procession, which was conducted from the Winter Palace to the Sts Peter and Paul Cathedral across the frozen river Neva on a specially-laid wooden ‘prospekt’. It had been announced publicly two days beforehand and a list of participants had been drawn up.⁴³⁴ This consisted of 166 different groups of mourners, including not only members of the Court and the top ranks of the civil/military administration, but also members of a number of social groups, like the merchantry (both Russian and foreign), representatives from other major towns and the Baltic German nobility. The military tone was reinforced by the fact that the procession was led by regimental musicians and the route was lined by over 10,000 troops from a number of regiments.⁴³⁵

The funeral was planned by General James (Iakov) Bruce and it has been generally thought that the inspiration for the various elements, in particular the imagery and public presentation, came from Swedish and German examples.⁴³⁶ Peter had issued

431. For a detailed description of the ‘chamber of mourning’, see *Opisanie poriadka derzhannogo pri pogrebenii blazhennyia vysokoslavnyiia i vernodostoineishiia pamiati vsepresvetleishago derzhavneishago Petra Velikago* (St Petersburg: Senatskaia Tip., 1725), pp. 1-10.

432. *Opisanie poriadka*, p. 2.

433. *O smerti Petra Velikago Imperatora Rossiiskogo. Kratkaia povest’* (St Petersburg: Senatskaia Tip., 1726), p. 238.

434. *Opisanie poriadka*, p. 13.

435. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, pp. 262-63.

436. Wortman, *Scenarios of Power*, vol. 1, p. 75.

an *ukaz* in April 1723 on gathering information about funeral practices at other European courts, and reports were submitted from Berlin, Vienna, Paris and Stockholm. Ageeva highlights Prince Sergei Dolgorukii's notes on the funeral ceremony of the Electress of Saxony, dating to February 1724, with its details on the *castrum doloris* and the funeral procession to the church.⁴³⁷ Peter had already organised Western-style funerals for a number of his close associates, most notably General Patrick Gordon and Franz Lefort in the late 1690s and Admiral Fedor A. Golovin in 1707, all of which took place in Moscow. Similarly Western elements had been used in the funerals for members of the Imperial family during his reign, the majority of which took place in St Petersburg in the period 1715-25. These included the numerous funerals for Peter and Catherine's children who died in infancy, as well as the major ceremonial occasions for the interment of Peter's half-sister, Natal'ia Alekseevna, in November 1717 and his son, Aleksei Petrovich, in June 1718.⁴³⁸ For example, Weber witnessed the funeral processions for Peter's daughter-in-law, Princess Charlotte of Wolfenbüttel, in October 1715 and for Marfa Matveevna, widow of Tsar Fedor Alekseevich, in January 1716, which was conducted from the 'house of mourning' to the Sts Peter and Paul Cathedral across the frozen Neva river, with the route lined by 'a double row of Flambeaus'.⁴³⁹ A procession featuring a route across the Neva was necessarily dependent on the time of year and, in the cases of Natal'ia Alekseevna, Aleksei and Catherine I, who died in May 1727, this was not possible as the river was no longer frozen. In the latter case, there is little information about the funeral itself, save that it was accompanied by cannon fire from both fortresses and yachts moored on the Neva, whilst the regiments garrisoned in St Petersburg played music and beat drums.⁴⁴⁰

As the funeral of the young Peter II took place in Moscow, the next major Imperial funeral to occur in St Petersburg was that of Anna Ivanovna in December 1740. This largely followed the model established for Peter I, to the extent that proceedings were delayed (Anna died on 17 October) until the ice on the Neva had hardened sufficiently to allow the funeral procession to the Sts Peter and Paul Cathedral.

437. Ol'ga G. Ageeva, 'Peterburgskii traurnyi tseremonial Doma Romanovykh v nachale XVIII v.', in *Fenomenon Peterburga*, ed. by Iurii N. Bespiatykh (St Petersburg: BLITs, 2001), pp. 503-4.

438. Ageeva, 'Peterburgskii traurnyi tseremonial', pp. 491 and 496-97.

439. Weber, *The Present State of Russia*, vol. 1, pp. 110-11.

440. Lindsey Hughes, 'The Funerals of the Russian Emperors and Empresses' (forthcoming).

However there were important differences with regard to the public nature of the event. For example, the body was moved to the small hall of the 'old' (i.e. Petrine) Summer Palace in mid November and lay in state until 16 December, when it was placed in the coffin and surrounded by the various crowns and other items of Imperial regalia. For the next week, it was possible for 'people of all ranks' (*liudi vsekh chinakh*) to visit this room between 9.00-11.30am and 2.00-5.00pm every day. Indeed so many people came to mourn that the black drapery at the entrance was damaged and had to be replaced.⁴⁴¹ This practice was repeated for the funeral of Elizabeth in January 1762, with the body being moved to a more public 'mourning room' ten days before the funeral ceremony and 'the crowds' allowed to view it twice a day.⁴⁴² Thus Imperial funerals had a much more public character than those of their Muscovite predecessors, enabling a larger number of people to participate in the mourning process and emphasising the lifetime achievements of the deceased as much as the commemoration of their blessed memory.

- Fireworks

Having discussed several of the major Court celebrations in this period, I will now look at firework displays, which were an important component in virtually all of the events discussed above. They were not only highly visible and therefore widely accessible to the city's inhabitants, but were also used to convey messages and symbols to this audience, which could be reinforced by the publication of images and descriptions. Fireworks had been used in Russian celebrations during the seventeenth century. For example, Aleksei Mikhailovich himself had participated in a fireworks display, involving rockets, for the Shrovetide (*Maslenitsa*) celebrations in 1672.⁴⁴³ However, it was during Peter I's reign that they became firmly established as an integral part of 'public' celebrations of all varieties. Historians have offered several explanations for the prevalence of fireworks and illuminations during Peter's reign. For example, they can be seen as a very visible and audible demonstration of the military power of the State, hence their prominence in military victory celebrations (discussed below).⁴⁴⁴ They were also a symbol of Westernisation, both in terms of their technology and the imagery they

441. Petrov, *Istoriia Sankt-Peterburga*, pp. 429-30.

442. Catherine II, *Memoirs*, ed. by Dominique Maroger (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1955), pp. 337-38.

443. Vladimir N. Vasil'ev, *Starinnye feierverki v Rossii, XVII - pervaiia chetvert' XVIII veka* (Leningrad: Izd. gos. Ermitazha, 1960), p. 10.

444. Zelov, *Ofitsial'nye svetskie prazdniki*, pp. 100-12.

employed.⁴⁴⁵ Similarly, they can be linked to Peter's fascination with machines, particularly those which had a military application.⁴⁴⁶

Peter's interest in fireworks began as a young man, and his notebooks from the 1680s include a number of pages on the construction of rockets.⁴⁴⁷ Given this background, it is perhaps no coincidence that Peter began his military 'career' as a bombardier and, as with his enthusiasm for sailing, there was a pragmatic element to his personal enjoyment. He allegedly told the Prussian ambassador, Baron von Mardefeld, that fireworks helped prepare people for the noise of battle, as well as being enjoyable in their own right.⁴⁴⁸ The role of these illuminations in the wider political and social context of Peter's reign is usually contrasted with their role in the reigns of his successors. A common view is that Peter used such fireworks displays as a means to illustrate important themes or motifs in his reforming policies, as shown by the conscious use of Imperial imagery. On the other hand, subsequent rulers, notably Elizabeth, were more interested in their use as a form of entertainment, albeit a spectacular one which reflected the magnificence of the Imperial Court.⁴⁴⁹ Although this is undoubtedly true to some extent, given that Peter's interests were much more inclined toward the military than those of either his niece or his daughter, it is important to add that the prominent position of such fireworks in Court celebrations can be linked to the emphasis on spectacle at the Russian Court.

There were two main influences on the development of fireworks in Russia as a 'public' spectacle in the first half of the eighteenth century. The first influence was the growing involvement of the Academy of Sciences in the planning and creation of Court fireworks displays. The second influence was the appointment of Burkhard Christoph von Münnich to the post of *general-fel'dtseikhmeister*, or head of the artillery, by Anna Ivanovna in 1731. His collaboration with the Academy of Sciences had begun in 1728, when Münnich (a military engineer by training) was planning a fireworks display for the coronation of Peter II. He contacted the Academy of Sciences about designs for the

445. Barbara W. Maggs, "Firework Art and Literature: Eighteenth-Century Pyrotechnical Tradition in Russia and Western Europe", *Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 54 (1976), pp. 24-40.

446. Werrett, 'An Odd Sort of Display', pp. 47-48.

447. *Pis'ma i bumagi Imperatora Petra Velikago*, ed. by Afanasii F. Bychkov (St Petersburg: Gosudarstvennaia tip., 1887), vol. 1, pp. 1-10.

448. Anecdote from Stählin, quoted in Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 278.

449. Anisimov, *Rossii v seredine XVIII veka*, p. 181.

display and was assigned Karl Beckenstein, a professor of jurisprudence who had previously provided poetry and music for Petrine celebrations. This collaboration proved successful and they worked together again on the designs for the coronation of Anna Ivanovna in 1730. Following his promotion, Münnich was largely responsible for transforming the production of firework displays by moving the main firework laboratory to the Second Arsenal, on Voskresenskaia ulitsa. The rationale behind the move was clearly linked to the danger of producing explosives, since the new site was beside the city's main military hospital.⁴⁵⁰

At the same time, plans were made to alter the manner in which such displays were viewed by their audience. During Peter's reign, the displays consisted of individual set-pieces on fixed screens which the audience could move between and some of the spectacle was dissipated by the technical apparatus which surrounded them. In October 1731, Münnich took the decision to construct a 'theatre of fireworks', a six-hundred foot jetty from the Strelka on Vasil'evskii island, stretching out onto the river Neva.⁴⁵¹ This provided a focal point for the audience of any firework display, primarily intended for spectators in one of the Imperial palaces (initially the Apraksin Palace and later the Winter Palace), making use of the distance to conceal the technical side of the presentation and the expanse of water to enhance the sound and light of the display. The 'theatre' was opened with a display on the evening of 28 April to celebrate Anna Ivanovna's return from Moscow and the anniversary of her coronation. The design of the images for the displays was overseen by another member of the Academy of Sciences, Gottlieb-Friedrich Juncker, a poet from Leipzig who had been invited to St Petersburg specifically to compose this sort of Court spectacle.⁴⁵²

This example highlights several important points with regard to the development of fireworks. There was a move toward such illuminations as an extension of theatrical entertainment, with the displays forming a cohesive whole containing a message for its audience, which required more comprehensive planning than the previous stand-alone displays to ensure that the various elements worked together. Part of this development was the need for binding themes for the various displays, hence the involvement of

450. Werrett, 'An Odd Sort of Display', pp. 77-82.

451. M. A. Alekseeva, 'Teatr feierverkov v Rossii XVIII veka', in *Teatral'noe prostranstvo: materialy nauchnoi konferentsii* (Moscow: Izd. GMI imeni A. S. Pushkina, 1979), pp. 291-307.

452. Werrett, 'An Odd Sort of Display', pp. 83-86.

members of the Academy of Sciences to devise and co-ordinate the imagery. Although this extensive planning had certainly been a feature introduced by the Petrine displays, the fact that it continued under his successors calls into question Grebeniuk's and others' argument that post-Petrine fireworks were primarily for opulent display and entertainment.⁴⁵³ In fact, after Peter's death, such celebrations increasingly marked accession, coronation and other dynastic anniversaries: the controversial circumstances surrounding the advent to power of many rulers make it probable that firework displays had an ideological significance, emphasising both the ruler's legitimacy and continuity with preceding reigns.⁴⁵⁴

Reporting Court Events

Although one of the main aims of these Court celebrations was to make an immediate impact on the audience present at the event itself, or those who could witness part of it from the sidelines, there was also a recognition that a wider audience, both within Russia and abroad, could be reached through the medium of print. Publications could be used to celebrate major events, such as Imperial coronations, by informing the audience about other aspects of the celebrations, such as the allegorical images which formed the basis of fireworks displays, in order to condition their understanding and responses to them. There was also a commemorative element in such publications so that, as well as the contemporary audience, the celebrations could be recorded and accessed in posterity.⁴⁵⁵ For illuminations and firework displays, this process had begun with short descriptions published as pamphlets by the Moscow Academy during Peter's reign, and these short booklets continued to be produced throughout the century, although the responsibility for their compilation and publication was transferred to the Academy of Sciences. In the first half of the century, such booklets had a print-run of 300 and were sold in the Academy's bookshop.⁴⁵⁶

Under Anna Ivanovna and Elizabeth, the Academy of Sciences was put in charge

453. V. P. Grebeniuk, 'Publichnye zrelishcha petrovskogo vremeni i ikh sviaz' s teatrom', *Novye cherty v russkoi literature i iskusstve (XVII - nachala XVIII v.)*, ed. by A. N. Robinson (Moscow: Nauka, 1976), p. 139.

454. Zelov, *Ofitsial'nye svetskiiye prazdniki*, p. 196 and Werrett, 'An Odd Sort of Display', p. 79.

455. For the background to this, see Wortman, *Scenarios of Power*, vol. 1, pp. 13-21.

456. Werrett, 'An Odd Sort of Display', pp. 96-97. For some examples, see *Kniga i knigotorgovlia v Rossii v XVI-XVIII vv.*, ed. by G. V. Bakhareva and Sergei P. Luppov (Leningrad: Biblioteka Akadamii Nauk SSSR, 1984), pp. 87-93.

of preparing special commemorative albums for their coronations, with descriptions of the celebrations accompanied by engravings of principal elements, such as processions, illuminations and masquerades.⁴⁵⁷ In the case of Elizabeth's album, the initial print-run was 1200 copies - 600 in Russian, 300 in French and 300 in German - and it was suggested that it should be distributed amongst the various administrative bodies in Russia, as well as being sent to foreign courts, to ensure wide exposure.⁴⁵⁸ Another important outlet for printed descriptions of these events, including details of the illuminations, was the *Sanktpeterburgskie Vedomosti* (also discussed below, in Chapter Five), which again allowed them to reach a wider audience. However, the extent to which this succeeded in informing the audience remains very difficult to judge, since contemporary accounts by observers contain at most a brief mention that such displays took place.⁴⁵⁹

The descriptions of Court functions carried in the *Vedomosti* tended to focus on details of what occurred and who was present. Times were given for the different stages of an event, although probably reflecting the intended schedule or timetable, rather than the reality of the situation. Some details on the individuals and, more usually, broader groups of people who were present at these events, such as foreign ministers and the various distinguished groups within Russian society (such as the *Generalitet* and senior ranks of the army), were usually noted, with the focus squarely on their rank. Other details are more curious to the modern reader - the number of candles on the chandeliers, the types of refreshments that guests could enjoy, the rich clothing of the guests. All of these details reflected the social status of the occasions and may indicate that such accounts were written with conspicuous consumption in mind. The Court played a key role in shaping the fashions of the period, in terms of clothing, accessories and even items such as household furnishings. By publicising such details, in effect the

457. *Opisanie koronatsii Eia Velichestva Imperatritsy i Samoderzhitsy Vserossiiskoi Anny Ioannovny torzhestvenno otpravlennoi v tsarstviushchem grade Moskve, 28 apreliia, 1730 g.* (Moscow: [Pech. pri Senate], 1730); *Obstoiatel'noe opisanie torzhestvennykh poriadkov blagopoluchnogo vshestiia v tsarstvuiushchii grad Moskvu i sviashchenneishei koronovaniia eia Avgusteishago imperatorskogo velichestva vsepresveteishiia derzhavneishiia velikiia gosudaryni Elisavety Petrovny, samoderzhitsy vserossiiskoi* (St Petersburg: Tip. Imp. Akademii Nauk, 1744).

458. *SK*, vol. II, pp. 330-32 and 356-57. For a detailed discussion of Elizaveta Petrovna's coronation album, see Wortman, *Scenarios of Power*, vol. 1, p. 91-106.

459. An important exception to this was Mikhail V. Danilov, who served as an artillery major and was responsible for the creation of firework displays in both Moscow and St Petersburg in the 1740s and 1750s. For further details, see Mikhail V. Danilov, *Zapiski M. V. Danilova, artillerii maiora, napisannyya im v 1771 godu (1722-62)* (Kazan': Molodyia Sily, 1913).

‘accessories’ of such social occasions, the Court could influence not only those who attended such events, but also those who read about them.

Having begun life as the official mouthpiece of the Russian State during the Great Northern War, it is hardly surprising that the *Vedomosti* remained an important part of the State’s means of disseminating information, a function reflected in its publication of a variety of *ukazy* and official announcements. Although these documents or the information contained in them sometimes existed in other forms, the *Vedomosti* allowed its readers a different perspective on several important events during this period. In part this was due to the fact that it was compiled and printed by the Academy of Sciences, located in St Petersburg, necessarily had some influence on its coverage of events in Moscow and other parts of the Empire. However, it seems likely that another major influence was related to the intended readership of the *Vedomosti*, and this will be discussed below in Chapter Five.

The occasion of Elizabeth’s coronation on 25 April 1742 provides a good example of the role of the *Vedomosti* in both spreading information on state celebrations and providing an alternative source of information from the other official accounts. An *ukaz* announcing plans for the Empress’s coronation was printed in the *Vedomosti* at the start of the year to inform all subjects ‘of every rank and dignity’ (*vsiakago china i dostoinstva*) to take part in public prayers for the health of their new ruler, to give thanks for her accession to the throne, and for a successful and peaceful reign. Specific mention was made of the spiritual, military and civil ranks, who were to be informed by means of ‘printed pages’ (*pechatnymi listy*). This may have included publication of such details in the *Vedomosti*, although the organ was not mentioned by name.⁴⁶⁰ The Empress’s coronation was to be held in the Moscow Kremlin, as tradition dictated, and the Court left St Petersburg on 22 February with the usual ceremony, involving cannon salutes from both of the city’s fortresses.⁴⁶¹ With the departure of the Court, unsurprisingly, the focus of the major official sources for this particular year shifted to Moscow. For example, the *Kamer-fur’erskii zhurnal* for this year was solely concerned with the coronation ceremony and celebrations in Moscow, and similarly the *Pridvornyi*

460. *StPb Ved.*, no. 3 (8 January 1742), pp. 22-23. See also *PSZ*, vol. XI, no. 8495 (1 January 1742), p. 557.

461. *StPb Ved.*, no. 17 (26 February 1742), p. 134. See also *PrZh*, 1742 (22 February), p. 14.

zhurnal only noted events relating to the Court's activities in the old capital.⁴⁶² This leaves the *Vedomosti* as an important source of information about the coronation celebrations not only in St Petersburg, but in the other major Russian towns and cities. Several days beforehand, an order appeared in the *Vedomosti* for singing in celebration and thanksgiving (*torzhestvennoe i blagodarnoe penie*), accompanied by church bells and cannon fire, for the coronation on 25 April in St Petersburg and other towns, as well as in the provinces.⁴⁶³

The reporting of the celebrations in St Petersburg was carried in a special supplement (*pribavlenie*) to No. 35, with a brief note in the text of that issue directing the reader to that account.⁴⁶⁴ According to this account, at 7am on 25 April, a total of 10,000 troops were drawn up in parade in front of the Winter Palace, under the command of *General-Anshef* Count Löwenwold, Lieutenants-General Prince von Holstein-Beck and Count Saltykov, and Majors-General Baron Bredel' and Lopukhin. This parade included the regiments of the Guard, the Horse Guards and the field regiments garrisoned in the city - the cavalry regiments included their cuirassier squadrons and the infantry regiments had their grenadier companies and regimental artillery. The troops garrisoned on Vasil'evskii island conducted a separate parade under the command of Major-General Karaulov, since the ice on the river was not considered safe to cross. At 9am there was a service in churches throughout the city, with the leading Court figures remaining in St Petersburg, such as Admiral Count Golovin and General Field-Marshal Count Lascy, attending the large Court church, along with the staff and senior officers of both the Guards regiments and the other branches of the military, members of the *Generalitet*, the English minister Finch and the Hungarian resident von Hochholtser. After the gospel, a rocket signalled the start of a cannon salute from both fortresses (a total of 262 guns), followed by three musket volleys from the troops on Vasil'evskii island and then on the Admiralty side, accompanied by their regimental guns. Then all of the troops threw their hats in the air and gave the traditional three shouts of *Vivat!*

At 1pm, guests (who had been invited by means of messengers sent out on 23/24

462. *KFZh*, 1742 and *PrZh*, 1742 (28 February - 15 December), pp. 15-40.

463. *StPb Ved.*, no. 33 (22 April 1742), p. 263.

464. *StPb Ved.*, no. 35 (29 April 1742), p. 278.

April) joined the spiritual, military and civil dignitaries to dine at specially-prepared tables in the palace, with silver and porcelain tableware. The number of guests was given as 250, with Captain Lopukhin and Lieutenant-Captain Miachkov of the Preobrazhenskii Guards in charge of proceedings. A list of the toasts proposed at this meal was included in this account, along with the number of cannon fired in salute for each 'health'. Meanwhile, outside the palace, another important 'public' element of such state celebrations was included with the distribution of wine and beer for the people (*narod*), and a sufficient amount of wine for the junior officers and soldiers of the various regiments, to drink the health of the Empress, with more shouts of *Vivat!* alongside the more generic *Ura!* At 5pm, Golovin and Lascy began a ball, which lasted until midnight. In the evening, on the arranged signal, the Fireworks Theatre (on Vasil'evskii island), the Sts Peter and Paul fortress, the Cadet Corps and many of the important (*znatnye*) houses around St Petersburg lit prepared illuminations, augmented by burning pyres on top of many ordinary houses, so that the whole city was 'decorated'. In addition, at 10pm, there was a firework display on Tsaritsyn meadow, beside the Winter Palace, which featured a central illumination featuring Elizabeth's initial letter with other important symbols, such as the Imperial crown and representations of the three Russian Chivalric Orders, and allegorical figures representing Wisdom and Bravery. There were also many smaller varieties of rockets and standing fireworks. This display lasted until 11.30pm. Finally, there was a brief mention of other popular celebrations (*narodnye vesel'ia*) marking the occasion, although they were not described.⁴⁶⁵

Further celebrations continued for the rest of April and into the following month, albeit recorded in much less detail than the main event. For example, towards the end of the account discussed above, a short paragraph mentioned a banquet and a ball on 26 April at Lascy's house. This entertainment was then repeated at Golovin's house the following evening, and so on, at the houses of the various *general-anshefy* and other members of the *Generalitet* for the next twelve evenings.⁴⁶⁶ Several issues later, we learn that two of the hosts were Lieutenant-General von Henning (on 3 May) and *General-Anshef* Vasilii Iakovlevich Levashov (on 4 May). These banquets appear to

465. *Pribavlenie k Vedomostiam* no. 35 (29 April 1742), pp. 281-84.

466. *Pribavlenie k Vedomostiam* no. 35 (29 April 1742), p. 284.

have involved all members of the *Generalitet* and the *Admiralitet* (obviously excepting those in Moscow), as well as other distinguished persons (*mnogikh drugikh znatnykh person*). These events involved the usual drinking of toasts during the banquet, accompanied by drums, trumpets and multiple cannon salutes, and then a ball (or other entertainment - *drugii uveseleniia*) until midnight.⁴⁶⁷ There is no indication given as to why these members of the elite were not in Moscow to participate in the main ceremony and celebrations, although practical concerns of administrations gave sufficient reason to ensure that the capital should not be deserted by high-ranking officials. It is also worth noting that all of the prominent figures mentioned in the *Vedomosti* reports, particularly those in charge of the different parts of the celebrations, were members of the military. Given that Russia was still at war with Sweden at the time, their continuing presence in St Petersburg, along with large numbers of troops, probably reflects the ongoing need for security over Court etiquette.

The account in the *Vedomosti* provides important details about the official celebrations for one of the most important events in the Court calendar. Crucially, it also provides information which is lacking in the other major official sources for this particular period, such as the *Kamer-fur'erskie zhurnaly*, which were focussed solely on the celebrations in Moscow. The major public celebrations in St Petersburg mirrored many of the elements which were an important part of the events in Moscow, such as the elaborate fireworks and the provision of liquid refreshment for the people. It is also significant that, even in the absence of the ruler, these celebrations took place in a public fashion, since it enabled members of the elite not present in Moscow to officially participate in celebrations that were traditionally a display of loyalty to the new ruler. Their reporting in the *Vedomosti*, alongside the descriptions of the ceremonies at the Kremlin, not only allowed a wider audience to 'experience' the spectacle, but also represented it in ideal terms. In this sense, the *Vedomosti* performed a similar role to the text which accompanied the engravings in the books produced for the coronations of Anna Ivanovna and Elizabeth. These not only described the events of the ceremonies themselves, but also the symbolism involved and the responses which were considered appropriate to such events.⁴⁶⁸

467. *StPb Ved.*, no. 38 (10 May 1742), pp. 306-7.

468. Wortman, *Scenarios of Power*, vol. 1, pp. 90-91.

Overall, this period witnessed the emergence of the Russian Court as a major State institution, with the first attempts to formalise the duties and responsibilities of its officials in the form of regulations. These regulations also extended to the members of the nobility who played an important part in the Court's various activities, both as the centre of elite social life in St Petersburg (discussed further in the next chapter) and as the organiser of the majority of 'public' celebrations in the city. These events also help characterise the Court's wider relationship with the city, by virtue of the use of the city's spaces and architectural features. Whilst the nobility were the principal audience (or 'public') for such events, the nature of these events and their location meant that they were also accessible by other groups. For example, certain events consciously included representatives of the city's leading groups, whilst the highly visible and audible nature of these events meant that many more people were able to passively observe them, and therefore also participate in a limited manner. However, the preparation and production of printed descriptions and images was the clearest example of the Court's desire to both publicise and control the reception of these events.

Chapter Four - Social Spaces and the Public

One of the major cultural developments in Russia during the first half of the eighteenth century can be seen in the changing social life of the elite and St Petersburg played a leading role in this process of change. Although this process had begun in Moscow, with the introduction of mixed company gatherings following Peter I's return from the Grand Embassy, it was continued in the 'new' setting of St Petersburg. There were two main reasons for this, both of which have been examined in previous chapters. Firstly, with the transfer of many of the main State institutions and the relocation of leading noble and merchant families to the city, together with the considerable amount of time that the tsar and his close circle spent there, the social elite was now largely resident in St Petersburg. Secondly, the deliberate planning of the city and its actual development led to important differences between the space of St Petersburg and the more traditional settings for the Russian elite, in other words Moscow and their estates. As a result, the new social forums which were introduced specifically in the city, such as the *assamblei*, took advantage of these differences and established the pattern of elite social life embodying many of the social changes introduced during Peter's reign. In part, this was due to the fact that the city became the main residence of the Court during this period and, as a result, was the site of both the celebrations and social life of that institution.

Having already discussed the major 'public' celebrations of the Court in St Petersburg during this period in Chapter Three, the emphasis in this chapter will be on the more select social spaces created initially by the Court elite, but which were gradually extended to include the wider nobility, other service personnel (principally military officers and cadets) and the city's wealthier merchants. There were undoubtedly elements in common between these social activities and the aforementioned 'public' festivities associated with major State occasions, and this can be seen particularly in the theatrical and musical entertainments of the Court at coronations. These spaces included several major elements in elite social life, principally the theatre, musical entertainment and the masquerade, and also a space within the city, the Imperial Summer Gardens. These elements have been chosen because they represent areas introduced by the Court and initially restricted to its members, but which were gradually opened to wider 'public' participation, albeit with a number of firm restrictions in place, related either to status, wealth or appearance. Also, foreign

companies hired by the Court often sought additional income by performing for a paying public and these will also be examined. The wider context of the everyday social life of members of the nobility will also be discussed to highlight a number of other activities, such as visiting, which dominated their 'public' life. Finally, there were several social activities open to both the social elite and the ordinary inhabitants of the city, including traditional forms of entertainment (often seasonal) and those of foreign entrepreneurs. The extent to which these social spaces could be accessed by a 'public', and the nature of participation within those spaces, will be examined.

Theatre Audiences

Theatre in Russia had its roots in the religious plays performed on certain feast-days, though this did not prevent secular theatre from being frowned upon by the clergy as immoral.⁴⁶⁹ Interest in Western-style theatrical performances as a form of entertainment emerged amongst the Muscovite elite during the 1660s. For example, Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich expressed an interest in hiring performers from England through one of his agents, John Hebdon, in 1660. Performances in private houses in Moscow began in the same period. Importantly, patrons included not only foreigners, witness the comedy performed for Charles Howard, the English ambassador, at his residence in 1664, but also a number of Russians, most notably Artamon S. Matveev (1625-82), a close associate of the tsar.⁴⁷⁰ In 1672, Aleksei Mikhailovich appointed Matveev to organise theatrical performances at Court, the first of which, *Artakserksovo deistvo*, was performed at Preobrazhenskoe in October of that year using foreign actors and musicians hired for the occasion.⁴⁷¹ However, given that the audience consisted only of the tsar, his wife and children (concealed behind a screen), and other members of the Court elite, this was essentially an exclusive social space. It was also relatively short-lived, lasting only until Aleksei Mikhailovich's death in 1676 when it was closed by his successor Fedor, probably acting on the advice of Patriarch Joachim. The materials associated with the theatre were disposed of and Court theatre did not re-emerge until

469. Catriona Kelly, 'The Origins of Russian Theatre', in *A History of Russian Theatre*, ed. by Robert Leach and Victor Borovsky (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 24-27.

470. Claudia R. Jensen, 'Music for the Tsar: A Preliminary Study of the Music of the Muscovite Court Theatre', *Musical Quarterly*, vol. 79, no. 2 (1995), p. 372.

471. Sergei K. Bogoiavlenskii, 'Moskovskii teatr pri tsariakh Aleksee i Petre', *ChOIDR*, vol. 2 (1914), pp. iv-x and 8-19.

the reign of Peter I.⁴⁷²

Peter had attended a number of theatrical performances during the Grand Embassy, in particular enjoying the benefit of a more intimate perspective whilst in London. As a result, he seems to have recognised the role that theatre played in Western cultural life. In 1702, he took the important step of opening Russia's first 'public' theatre, in other words one which was open to a paying audience, on Red Square. A German comedy troupe was hired at considerable expense to perform there, initially under Johann-Christian Kunst (until his death in 1705) and subsequently Otto Fürst. However, the theatre was not a success, in part due to the unfamiliar German repertoire and language barrier for the Russian members of the audience, but also to the location of the theatre, which meant that patrons had to pay a toll to enter the Kremlin, as well as the price of a seat in the theatre (3-10 kopecks). Consequently audiences were small (as few as fifty people in the autumn) and the theatre finally closed in 1713.⁴⁷³ There was continued interest from the royal family in the person of Peter's sister Natal'ia Alekseevna, who ran her own theatre at Preobrazhenskoe between 1707-10, and this moved with her to St Petersburg in 1711.⁴⁷⁴ Initially located in her palace on Krestovskii Island, the theatre was given its own building near her new residence on the Neva between Liteinyi prospekt and Voskresenskaia ulitsa.⁴⁷⁵ As with its Red Square predecessor, this was intended to be a 'public' theatre, as there is no evidence of any restrictions on attendance, with one contemporary visitor noting that 'every body was admitted' to ensure a decent audience. However, an important difference was that patrons did not have to pay for their seats.⁴⁷⁶

Nevertheless, the theatre did not last beyond Natal'ia's death in 1716, although the building continued to be used by visiting troupes, such as that of Johann Mann in mid-1723, prior to the construction of a new 'comedy house' on the Moika later that year.⁴⁷⁷ Bergholz attended a performance by Mann's troupe on 21 August 1723 and was

472. Hughes, *Sophia, Regent of Russia*, pp. 173-74.

473. Simon Karlinsky, *Russian Drama from its Beginnings to the Age of Pushkin* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1985), pp. 46-47.

474. For further discussion, see Il'ia S. Shliapkin, *Tsarevna Natal'ia Alekseevna i teatr ee vremeni* (St Petersburg: V. Balashev, 1898).

475. Vsevolod S. Gerngross (Vsevolodskii), *Teatral'nye zdaniia v Sankt-Peterburge v XVIII stoletii* (St Petersburg: Sirius, 1910), p. 4.

476. Weber, *Present State of Russia*, p. 189.

477. Gerngross, *Teatral'nye zdaniia*, p. 5.

singularly unimpressed, noting that Peter's daughters left early and the rest of the small audience were clearly not used to attending the theatre.⁴⁷⁸ In part, this may have reflected the attitude of the ruler since, although Peter attended such performances, he appears to have been frustrated by the passive nature of theatre, where one was required to sit and listen, rather than join in.⁴⁷⁹ For example, during a performance of the comedy 'Poor Jurgen' (*Bednyi Iurgen*) in January 1724, Peter preferred to make fun of one of his cooks, Hans Jurgen, at whom he threw flour whenever the name of the main character (i.e. Jurgen) was mentioned.⁴⁸⁰ Nevertheless, Peter's reign had established theatre as an acceptable form of social entertainment amongst the elite and the construction of the 'comedy house' in St Petersburg gave it a permanent presence, albeit one that remained underused until the 1730s. However, despite the 'public' nature of the theatres noted above, they failed to attract a regular paying audience in either Moscow or St Petersburg, and Bergholz tellingly noted that Mann's troupe would have starved, had it not been for their performances for Court audiences.⁴⁸¹

Anna Ivanovna had enjoyed the performances of foreign comedy troupes whilst in Mitau and, when she became Empress, she ordered that suitable troupes should be invited to come to St Petersburg to perform at her Court. This began with a company of German comedy actors sent from Dresden by Augustus II in January 1731.⁴⁸² At the same time, ballet emerged as a regular and important feature of the Court's social calendar in Russia. The Italian balletmaster Antonio Rinaldo Fuzano arrived with Francesco Araja's opera troupe in 1736, following considerable success elsewhere in Europe, particularly in Paris.⁴⁸³ Ballets were often performed alongside one-act comic *intermezzi* in the build-up to or between the acts of the main theatrical or operatic performance. Several pupils of the Court *tantsmeister* Jean-Baptiste Landé (discussed further in Chapter Five), most notably Aksin'ia Sergeeva and the sisters Elizaveta and Avdot'ia Timofeeva, appeared in these performances, and even the less-talented dancers

478. Bergholz, 'Dnevnik', *Iunost' derzhavy*, p. 131.

479. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 241.

480. Bergholz, 'Dnevnik', *Iunost' derzhavy*, p. 201.

481. Bergholz, 'Dnevnik', *Iunost' derzhavy*, p. 131.

482. On the introduction of theatre during Anna Ivanovna's reign, see the excellent introduction to *Teatral'naia zhizn' Rossii v epokhu Anny Ioannovny: dokumental'naia khronika, 1730-1740*, ed. by Liudmila M. Starikova (Moscow: Radiks, 1995), pp. 15-75.

483. Stählin, *Muzyka i balet*, p. 262.

were used in the *figurantes*.⁴⁸⁴

The issue of theatre audiences was one which appears to have concerned Elizabeth, as she repeatedly issued *ukazy* relating to the social composition and size of the intended audience for Court performances. Non-attendance at the Court theatres clearly annoyed her. At a French comedy in September 1752, she noted that her Court ladies (*stats-damy*) were not in their usual place (in the first row of the stalls) and sent word to them by means of a Court lackey, enquiring if they had forgotten that there was a performance that evening.⁴⁸⁵ Perhaps unsurprisingly, given the Orthodox attitude to the theatre discussed above, members of the Holy Synod enjoyed slightly more latitude in this respect, since their absence from a performance only the week before had been similarly noted, but no action was taken.⁴⁸⁶ Aside from the personal pressure which the Empress could undoubtedly bring to bear on absentees, several secondary accounts mention that Elizabeth enforced a fine of fifty rubles for members of the Court and other invited guests failing to attend the theatre without an adequate excuse.⁴⁸⁷ This mention of a fine has been regarded as Elizabeth's policy throughout her reign by some historians, possibly influenced by the similar methods employed by her father.⁴⁸⁸ However the available evidence suggests that this was one of the Empress's responses to the issue of partially full theatres, which emerged in the early 1750s.

Another response was to widen access to the Imperial Opera houses beyond the existing Court elite to increase attendances. For example, the *Kamer-fur'erskie zhurnaly* entry for 25th June 1751 notes the performance of a French comedy, at the Empress' request, in the Opera house. However, the small numbers present in both the stalls and along the circle prompted Elizabeth to order that distinguished merchants and their wives (*oboego pola znatnomu kupechestvu*) should be allowed unrestricted entry (*svobodnyi vkhod*) to tragedies, comedies and intermezzos. Importantly, the entry ends

484. Stählin, *Muzyka i balet*, p. 264.

485. *KFZh*, 1752, p. 66 (15 September).

486. *KFZh*, 1752, p. 65 (7 September).

487. *Zhizn' Derzhavina, po ego sochineniiam i pis'mam i po istoricheskim dokumentam*, ed. by Iakov K. Grot (Moscow and St Petersburg: Izd. Imp. Akademii nauk, 1880), vol. I, p. 103.

488. See, for example, Mikhail I. Pyliaev, *Staryi Peterburg. Rasskazy iz byloi zhizni stolitsy* (Moscow: IKPA, 1990), p. 73 and Vsevolod N. Vsevolodskii-Gerngross, *Istoriia russkogo teatra* (Moscow and Leningrad: Tea-Kino Pechat', 1929), vol. I, p. 462. It is also mentioned in relation to other Court entertainments, such as the *metamorfozy* masquerades, but with no indication of the source: Ivan N. Bozherianov, *Peterburgskaia starina: 24 ocherki i rasskazy* (St Petersburg: Izd. knizhnago sklada N. I. Ignatova, 1909), p. 163.

with the proviso that their clothing should not be ‘objectionable’ (*tol’ko b odety byli ne gнусno*).⁴⁸⁹ The *ukaz* was then issued by the *Pridvornaia kontora* on 27th June. It stated that the audience for performances in the Opera house - in other words, dignitaries (*znatnyiia liudi*), the nobility and their wives - was too small, making specific reference to the French comedy on 25th June. As a result, to avoid such small audiences (*chtob smotritelei ne malo bylo*), distinguished Russian and foreign merchants (no mention of the wives) were to be allowed to attend, providing they were dressed appropriately (*v pristoinom ubranstve*). The *ukaz* then specified where they were to be allowed to sit - in the upper circle, in the stalls (if there was room) or in the boxes to the rear (if they were empty). The details of this were to be sent from the Court Office to the General-Policemaster, who was responsible for notifying these people on such occasions.⁴⁹⁰

The nature of a paying public for theatre beyond the Court in Russia is more difficult to define than the audiences for performances at Court and for specific events, such as the celebrations surrounding an Imperial coronation or wedding. The existence of these wider audiences can be seen in the use of adjectives such as ‘free’ (*vol’noi*) to describe theatrical performances, but there is little indication of the social composition of this public in the records for this period. For example, the Opera house beside the Summer Palace staged a ‘free’ (*vol’noi*) comic opera on Saturday 17th January 1758, which the Empress also attended.⁴⁹¹ Later in the same year, on 14th May, there was another *vol’noi* performance of a Russian comedy (not named), this time in the ‘small’ theatre in the wooden Winter palace, attended by the Empress, the Grand Duke and the Grand Duchess. A footnote by the nineteenth-century editors of the *Kamer-fur’erskie zhurnaly* beside the word *vol’noi* provides a definition - *t.e. s platoi dlia publiki* - indicating that these performances were open to a paying public.⁴⁹² The arrival of Giovanni-Battista Locatelli’s company in Russia reveals the extent to which foreign impresarios relied on Imperial support, and of course sanction, just as much as the Imperial theatres themselves.⁴⁹³ The troupe was first mentioned in the *Kamer-fur’erskie*

489. *KFZh*, 1751, pp. 67-68 (25 June).

490. *RGIA*, f. 466, op. 1, d. 84, l. 76 (27 June 1751).

491. *KFZh*, 1758, pp. 13-14 (17 January).

492. *KFZh*, 1758, p. 72 (14 May).

493. For an excellent introduction on Locatelli and the activities of his theatrical troupe, see Vsevolod N. Vsevolodskii-Gerngross, *Teatr v Rossii po imperatritse Elisavete Petrovne* (St Petersburg: Giperion, 2003), pp. 100-32.

zhurnaly on 2nd December 1757, although given the effect of the Russian climate on travelling conditions, it had probably arrived slightly earlier in the year. The entry notes the troupe's rehearsal of an opera, which was to be part of the Empress's ongoing celebrations for the anniversary of her accession to the throne, on 25th November. The rehearsal took place in the Opera house and was open to anyone wishing to attend, reflected in the fact that there was no guard detachment. The entry noted the attendance of the Habsburg ambassador, several of the Empress's *stats-damy* and other dignitaries (*znatnyia persony*).⁴⁹⁴

The performance itself of the opera, named as *Ubezishche bogov*, took place the following evening and the description gives some interesting details about the considerable security on such an occasion. The usual guard detail outside the theatre consisted of a senior officer with sixty troops, whilst another senior officer with a further forty troops was stationed inside the theatre itself to take action in the event of a fire. In addition, there was an unspecified number of Court servants (*lakei*) in charge of admission and seating. The seating was as follows: the first five ranks (both genders) were on benches in the stalls, which appear to have carried an inscription or small notice to further differentiate rank (referred to by the phrase *v bankakh, po nadpisiam*), and in the boxes of the first circle; staff and junior officers of the Guards regiments and the Life Company stood along the sides of the stalls and in the space in front of the orchestra, whilst their families (usually only wives and older children) were in the boxes on the upper level, if there was not sufficient room in the gallery and the stalls. Merchants were to be admitted only if there was space to accommodate them. There was not to be intentional crowding simply to allow more people in.⁴⁹⁵ The details given in the *zhurnaly* entry are not unusual, except for the inclusion of numbers for the security arrangements and the requirement to control the audience numbers to avoid discomfort or the risk of spoiling the Empress's enjoyment of the performance. Further details come from a report to the General-Policemaster's Chancellery from the Court Office. The military were joined by members of the civil services (in equivalent ranks) in the areas where they were allowed to sit or stand

It is hardly surprising that the merchantry were the first group to be excluded

494. *KFZh*, 1757, p. 109 (2 December).

495. *KFZh*, 1757, pp. 109-10 (3 December).

when space was lacking at such events. One possibly reason for this is indicated by the entry for the following week: on 8th December, the *zhurnaly* record that Grand Duke Peter attended another performance of *Ubezishche bogov* at the Opera house by the same company, but this time the intended audience was those who were willing to pay (*dlia naroda, za den'gi*).⁴⁹⁶ The merchantry would be one such group, having had some access to theatre at Court performances but obviously not enjoying the benefit of regular invitations to such events. Without reliable information on the number of people who attended such performances, the popularity and indeed the desirability of these occasions for a paying audience is difficult to gauge. Another piece of evidence is the advertisement for this performance in the *Sanktpeterburgskie Vedomosti*:

Сего Декабря 8 дня на большом театре близ летняго дворца представлена будет для публики новоприбывшим сюда комическая оперы директором Локателлием, сочиненная на Италианском языке Драматическая пьеса называемая: *Убежище Богов*, с которой перевод на Российском языке продается в Академической книжной лавке без переплету по 12 копеек; а каким образом пропуск имеет быть зрителям, о том от него Локателлия объявится особливим печатным листом.⁴⁹⁷

Obviously, for the purposes of my study, the use of the word 'public' is significant, especially when compared to the description of the intended audience used in the *Kamer-fur'erskie zhurnaly*. Here it seems to imply an audience wider than just the Court, for whom the opera had been performed on 3rd December (an event not recorded in the newspaper), who were able to pay for the privilege. This performance was repeated again, on 23 December and it was noted in the *zhurnaly* due to the Grand Duke's attendance, obviously requiring a break from domestic bliss, following the birth of his daughter Anna on 9 December.⁴⁹⁸ Again, a notice similar to that above was published in the *Sanktpeterburgskie Vedomosti* several days beforehand.⁴⁹⁹

The Empress attended an operatic performance by Locatelli's troupe at Ekateringof on 27th May 1758.⁵⁰⁰ The fact that Ekateringof is very rarely mentioned in

496. *KFZh*, 1757, p. 111 (8 December).

497. *StPb Ved.*, no. 97 (5 December 1757), p. 7.

498. *KFZh*, 1757, p. 122 (23 December).

499. *StPb Ved.*, no. 101 (19 December 1757), p. 8.

500. *KFZh*, 1758, p. 75 (27 May).

relation to the theatre implies that this may have been a private viewing for the Empress only, possibly in a temporary theatre. She attended two further performances, on successive Mondays, but the entries do not specify where they took place or what exactly the troupe performed, merely noting that an opera was performed.⁵⁰¹ Finally, there appears to have been a performance by two *castrati* from Locatelli's company, singing excerpts from a comic opera for Elizabeth, her Court ladies and gentlemen at Monplezir.⁵⁰² These performances were not mentioned in the *Sanktpeterburgskie Vedomosti*. Locatelli himself subsequently moved to Moscow in 1759, where he opened his own theatre with a state subsidy. However the taste for theatre in Moscow was not as well-established as it was in St Petersburg and without the financial support of the Court elite, Locatelli found it difficult to make financial ends meet. Thus, despite a contract with Moscow University to have a group of students translate contemporary European drama, he was forced to declare bankruptcy in 1762.⁵⁰³

Although the practice of producing opera *libretti* for the Russian audiences had been introduced along with the form itself in the mid 1730s, it was usually restricted to major Court performances. Prominent examples included the first opera performance in Russia, *La forza dell'amore e dell'odio* in January 1736 and the opera *La Clemenza de Tito* and its associated ballets, to celebrate the coronation of Elizabeth in April 1742. These opera *libretti* were sold at the Academy bookshop in St Petersburg from the late 1740s and became a common feature in the lists of book sales, even when the native language of the opera was Russian.⁵⁰⁴ The spread of these materials has been linked to the need for authors to ensure some degree of understanding of themes and motifs in their work, especially if it had an allegorical message that might be lost on an audience carried along by the action on-stage or unsure of the words being sung. Stählin was certainly aware of this when he wrote the prologue 'Russia from sorrow has now rejoiced' for *La Clemenza de Tito*. Similarly Aleksandr Sumarokov, Russia's leading playwright in this period, dealt with the theme of the ruler's duty to the people and to God, not only in his own plays *Khorev* (1747) and *Sinav i Truvor* (1750), but also in his

501. *KFZh*, 1758, pp. 77-78 (1 and 8 June).

502. *KFZh*, 1758, p. 106 (4 July).

503. Galina N. Dobrovol'skaia, 'Lokatelli', in *Muzykal'nyi Peterburg. Entsiklopedicheskii slovar': XVIII vek. Kniga 2: K-P*, ed. by Anna L. Porfir'eva (St Petersburg: Kompozitor, 2000), pp. 141-43.

504. Pisarenko, *Povsednevnaia zhizn' russkogo dvora*, p. 292.

translation of *Hamlet* (1748), thereby highlighting an aspect of the plot which was not the main focus of Shakespeare's original. The moral tone of such plays, exposing the folly of vice, was a popular theme in eighteenth-century Russian literature of all kinds. The sense of civic responsibility and the stress on the need for proper conduct also fit into a wider context which the contemporary, predominantly noble audience could identify with.⁵⁰⁵ Whilst the moral tone of the plays was certainly acceptable to Elizabeth, it has been suggested that the implications for her absolute authority of Sumarokov's views on the obligations and responsibilities of the ruler presumably escaped her notice, since she proved an enthusiastic patron of the theatre and his work therein.⁵⁰⁶

It should not be forgotten that, as well as being a form of entertainment and a possible forum for ideas, the theatre was a place to see and be seen. Theatrical attendance became an important part of Petersburg social life. It could be an introduction to society for the younger members of a noble family. For example, Aleksandr R. Vorontsov noted in his autobiographical notes about attending the Court theatre:

Il y avait au Théâtre de la Cour, deux fois par semaine, comédie française; mon père nous y faisait aller dans une loge qu'il obtint.⁵⁰⁷

It was also a suitable occasion to display one's wealth, through clothing or jewellery, or status, through the position of one's seat. The foyer of a theatre, as much as a *kurtag* or a masquerade, was a social forum and an opportunity to interact.⁵⁰⁸ It is hardly surprising, then, that this desire would spread beyond the immediate environment of the Court to the other prominent social groups in St Petersburg, principally the officers of the Guards regiments and the city's wealthier merchants. For the grander State occasions (such as an Imperial anniversary or birthday), they might be granted access to the Court theatres by invitation, but it is not unreasonable to suggest that the prospect of paying to go to a similar event was something worth considering for those who could

505. Elise Kimerling Wirtschafter, *The Play of Ideas in Russian Enlightenment Theatre* (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2003), pp. 29-31.

506. Evgenii V. Anisimov, *The Empress Elizabeth: Her Reign and her Russia, 1741-1761*, trans. John T. Alexander (Gulf Breeze, FL: Academic International Press, 1995), p. 197.

507. *Arkhiv kniazia Vorontsova*, vol. V, p. 12.

508. Efim G. Kholodov, *Teatr i zritel'i: stranitsy istorii russkoi teatral'noi publiki* (Moscow: Gos. institut iskusstvovedeniia, 2000), pp. 213-14.

afford it and also sought the socio-cultural cachet of such participation.

Musical Entertainments

Certain forms of music already had an established role in Court ceremonies, both civil and religious, and in official celebrations throughout the seventeenth century, and this continued to be the case during the eighteenth century. Although the music on such occasions tended to be dominated by the Orthodox Church choral tradition, there is evidence to suggest that Western musicians and instruments began to feature from the 1620s onwards, particularly during the reign of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich.⁵⁰⁹ At the same time, the existing folk tradition was a popular element in the festivities of the peasantry and other social groups. In particular, this type of entertainment was provided by groups of *skomorokhi* or 'minstrels', whose activities can be traced as far back as the eleventh century.⁵¹⁰ Although their performances incorporated elements of theatre and mime, often with bawdy intent, they were primarily musical in focus, using popular folk songs as their mainstay.⁵¹¹ However, during the first half of the eighteenth century, musical performances using Western instruments emerged as a form of entertainment in its own right, distinct from both of the above traditions. There were several important elements to this development. Firstly, such musical performances formed part of the new social situation which emerged, particularly in St Petersburg, during the reign of Peter I. Secondly, both the music and many of the musicians who performed it were from Western Europe, predominantly Italian, French and German.

In a similar manner to theatrical performances (including opera and ballet), musical performances were gradually introduced to a wider audience primarily through the groups of foreign musicians hired to perform for both Court celebrations and at other social events organised by members of the elite. Several of the major figures of this period had personal orchestras and choirs for such performances, including Prince Aleksandr D. Menshikov and *general-prokuror* Pavel M. Iaguzhinskii.⁵¹² Although the term 'concert' emerged during the reign of Peter I, it was used mainly in the sense of

509. Jensen, 'Music for the Tsar', p. 371.

510. For a useful English introduction to the *skomorokhi*, see Russell Zguta, *Russian Minstrels: A History of the Skomorokhi* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1978).

511. Kelly, 'The Origins of Russian Theatre', pp. 19-21.

512. Gerald R. Seaman, *History of Russian Music, Volume 1: From its Origins to Dargomyzhsky* (Oxford and New York: Blackwell, 1967), pp. 63-64.

agreement (i.e. *soglasie*).⁵¹³ The use of the term to describe a musical performance emerged only during the reign of Anna Ivanovna.⁵¹⁴ However it was during the reign of Elizabeth that concerts emerged as a form of entertainment for a paying ‘public’.⁵¹⁵ A number of the Western composers and musicians took the opportunity to earn money, in addition to their Court salaries, by organising performances for a paying audience, outside the Empress’s immediate circle. One of the first recorded instances of this appeared in the notices section of the *Sanktpeterburgskie Vedomosti* in mid-1746. An unnamed foreign bass singer was to perform, with musical accompaniment, at 7pm in the house of General Zagriazskii, beside the German theatre. Tickets were on sale at the aforementioned house at one rouble per person.⁵¹⁶

For the potential entrepreneur who moved beyond the immediate surroundings of the Court, and consequently the resources and support that it afforded to such performers, there were a number of practical concerns. For example, in order to stage such a concert, one had to approach a house-owner with appropriately-sized premises and propose holding a ‘public’ concert in his (or her) house, in other words, open it to a paying public. Indeed, the fact that such concerts took place near, but not in the major theatres in St Petersburg perhaps indicates a recognition that they would not attract the same numbers as the already-established theatrical performances and therefore might not recover the money needed to hire the large theatre buildings.⁵¹⁷ If the potential host agreed, then the next step was to gain permission to hold such a gathering from the Police Chancellery since, as noted in Chapter Two, failure to do so could lead to a considerable fine or a spell in the galleys.

After the event had been approved by the police, a flyer/poster (*afisha* or *letuchka*) was printed and distributed in public areas, such as the city’s main squares and markets, giving details of the intended performance and where it would take place. Significantly,

513. Nikolai A. Smirnov, *Zapadnoe vliianie na russkii iazyk v petrovskuiu epokhu* (St Petersburg: Tip. Imp. Akademii nauk, 1910), p. 161.

514. See the excerpts from both the *Sanktpeterburgskie Vedomosti* and its *Primechaniia* listed in the definition for *Kontsert* in *Slovar' russkogo iazyka XVIII veka*, ed. by Stepan G. Barkhudarov et al. (St Petersburg: Nauka, 1998), vol. X, p. 155.

515. See, for example, Abram A. Gozenpud, *Muzykal'nyi teatr v Rossii: ot istokov do Glinki. Ocherki* (Leningrad: Muzgiz, 1959), p. 55 and Anisimov, *Rossia v seredine XVIII veka*, p. 172.

516. *StPb Ved.*, no. 54 (10 July 1746), p. 334.

517. Petr N. Stolpianskii, *Muzyka i muzitsirovanie v starom Peterburge* (Leningrad: Muzyka, 1989), p. 15.

these notices also contained details of which groups of people were allowed to attend and what they would be asked to pay for a ticket. An important exception to the ticketing arrangement were ‘distinguished’ (*znatnye*) patrons, who could pay according to their own discretion, rather than any fixed fee. The elevated social status of such individuals was certainly one factor, since organisers were keen to attract members of the elite to ‘raise the tone’. This status also meant that such *znatnye* did not expect to have to pay in the first place - indeed, such a request would not only caused considerable offence, but carried the possibility of a beating from the noble’s servants. On the other hand, by making any contribution purely discretionary, the organisers could use the desire of members of the elite to appear generous and cultured to their advantage, whilst reaping the aforementioned benefit of their attendance.⁵¹⁸

Two examples of musical performances outside the setting of a theatre illustrate a number of these points. The first instance was a series of concerts, according to the Italian, English and Dutch manner (*kontserty po ital’ianskomu, aglinskomu i golanskomu maneru*), which were to take place on Wednesdays, beginning on 5 October 1748, at 7pm in the house of Prince Gagarin on Bol’shaia Morskaia ulitsa, opposite the German Comedy theatre. Importantly it is noted that these concerts were being played for a number of music enthusiasts (*po zhelaniiu nekotorykh okhotnikov do muzyki*). Organisers seem to have had a potential audience in mind - tickets were available for one rouble per person, and an invitation was extended to all ‘distinguished’ persons (*znatnye gospoda*), merchants and townsmen (*meshchane*). There was also a note that the singing would be in Italian, Russian, English and German. On the other hand, drunken servants and ‘unsuitable’ women (*bezdel’nye zhenshchiny* - possibly indicating prostitutes) were not allowed to attend.⁵¹⁹ The second example was a concert at 9pm on 28 June 1750, performed in the house of Madame Kern (*gospozha Kernsha*), opposite the Admiralty meadow. The notice added that this location had been used previously to stage performances by the Italian bass Basserini. Again, tickets cost one rouble per person and servants were not allowed to attend.⁵²⁰ Both cases not only demonstrate that an audience for such performances existed in St Petersburg, but also

518. Stolpianskii, *Muzyka i muzitsirovanie*, p. 22.

519. *StPb Ved.*, no. 81 (4 October 1748), p. 698. This notice was published again at the end of the month, in no. 87.

520. *StPb Ved.*, no. 51 (26 June 1750), p. 406.

give some indication of ability to pay and which elements of society were excluded. The fact that both of these performances were advertised in the *Sanktpeterburgskie Vedomosti*, which will be discussed further in Chapter Five in terms of its potential readership, is also worth noting.

Another example of how elements of Court entertainment spread to wider society is the emergence of ‘dance evenings’ organised by private individuals, beginning in the 1730s. It is hardly surprising that foreigners were prominent in this development and this is reflected in the names of the organisers discussed below. The wider accessibility of these events can be seen in the varied social backgrounds of these individuals - Semenova highlights examples such as a corporal in the Guards, a valet (*kamerdiner*), a port official and a shoemaker.⁵²¹ In order to hold such an event, these individuals had to hire a suitably-sized room in the house of a noble or a merchant and musicians to provide accompaniment for the dancing - usually regimental musicians, since they were cheaper than the foreign orchestras used by the Court. Refreshments, ranging from tea and coffee to alcoholic drinks, had to be provided for the paying patrons, along with other forms of entertainment, such as tables for card-playing or a ticket lottery with prizes.⁵²² Another important part of the organisation process was to notify the Police Chancellery about the time, location and expected number of participants for the event, in order to ensure that the venue was not raided and the organisers arrested. It was also significant that such ‘dance evenings’ provided a convenient cover for organised prostitution, as discussed above in Chapter Two.

One of the principal differences between the balls organised by the Court and these ‘dance evenings’ was the wider accessibility of the latter, on account of their need to attract a paying public. As a result, organisers had to ensure that the event was appropriately publicised and there is evidence that during the planning stage the organisers had in mind particular groups within society. For example, at the upper end of the social scale, there were the dances organised by M. Vintsler, which catered for army officers, merchants, ship captains and administrative officials (*prikaznye liudi*). By contrast, events organised by Fershter and the (unnamed) valet, mentioned above,

521. Lidiia N. Semenova, ‘Obshchestvennye razvlecheniia v Peterburge v pervoi polovine XVIII v.’, in *Staryi Peterburg: Istoriko-etnograficheskie issledovaniia*, ed. by Natal’ia V. Iukhneva (Leningrad: Nauka, 1982), p. 163.

522. Semenova, *Ocherki istorii byta*, p. 206.

catered for other groups within urban society who were willing and could afford to attend, which included army ensigns, tradesmen, publicans (*traktirshchiki*) and even servants.⁵²³ In order to ensure a degree of social homogeneity, and thus avoid any potential social friction between the various groups of participants, several limitations on attendance were imposed by the organisers. For example, it could be stipulated that admission was by invitation only, as with the more exclusive dances attended by military officers, or the details of such events could be spread primarily by word of mouth, rather than by printed *afisha*. Another limitation was the price of the entrance ticket, which ranged between fifty kopecks and a rouble during this period, depending on the rank and social origin of the participants. Semenova also notes that these prices only really applied to male patrons, since the relatively small number of women in St Petersburg during this period and their important role as dancing partners meant that they were generally allowed free entry to these gatherings.⁵²⁴

There are several important points raised by both musical concerts and dance evenings. Firstly, as with theatre, these areas had previously been restricted to members of the Court elite, who could afford to pay for foreign musicians and could host such events in their homes. However, the opportunities presented by allowing a wider and , more importantly, paying ‘public’ encouraged entrepreneurs to organise their own versions of these events. They not only represented a form of entertainment, but also a social space in which they could interact. In particular, the involvement of women, with the exception of the wives of military officers and wealthy merchants who had the possibility to attend similar Court-organised events (discussed further below), encouraged them to gradually overcome their social reticence. However, as with the other aspects of social life discussed in Chapter Two, these areas were still subject to official scrutiny, not least due to the implications of mixed company interaction.

Masquerades

As with several other elements of the Court’s social life during the first half of the eighteenth century, the masquerade was a foreign import, linked to existing festive traditions in Russia. Unsurprisingly, given its attitude to dancing and music, the

523. For details on these various events, see the references to *RGADA*, f. 8, op. 1, d. 10 in Semenova, ‘Obshchestvennye razvlecheniia’, p. 163, fn. 74 and 75.

524. Semenova, ‘Obshchestvennye razvlecheniia’, p. 163.

Orthodox Church disapproved of these occasions, since masks were traditionally associated with possession by a spirit and were only tolerated as part of the Christmas/Easter play cycles, which also had an influence on other early Russian theatrical entertainments.⁵²⁵ Although Lotman is keen to use the masquerade as a contrast to the parade in the spectrum of elite social occasions, with the ball providing the middle ground, the early examples of Court masquerades in Russia do not quite fit this model. During Peter I's reign, there were a number of elaborate masquerades, the most notable examples having been discussed above in Chapter Two (in connection with Court spectacle), such as the extended celebrations for the Peace of Nystadt in October 1721. However, apart from the behaviour of Peter himself, there was very little question of spontaneous or unrestricted behaviour infringing social conventions on these occasions, unlike contemporary, and indeed earlier European examples.⁵²⁶ Rather, these celebrations were often intricately planned, not least by Peter personally, with stipulations about costumes, attendance, the order of floats in processions, and many other details. The wider purpose of these entertainments has been compared to a form of theatre, in which the participants (in other words, members of the elite) celebrated authority, rather than tried to undermine it.⁵²⁷

Whatever the symbolic significance of the masquerade in Russia, it became an established part of the Court social calendar under Peter's successors. During the reign of Elizabeth, the masquerade underwent several important changes, with the most important of these for the development of a 'public' in St Petersburg being the conscious effort to widen access to this type of social event through the creation of 'public' (*publichnyi* or *vol'noi*) masquerades or masked balls, in addition to the more select versions attended by the Court elite. The adjectives *publichnyi* and *vol'noi* were used in the descriptions of the events in both the official Court accounts and also in contemporary personal accounts. However, in several cases, their specific application varied insofar as the terms appeared to be interchangeable. Thus it is only through an examination of the composition of the guests at such events that we can begin to see who exactly these terms were intended to describe.

525. Lotman, *Besedy o russkoi kul'tury*, p. 100.

526. Terry Castle, *Masquerade and Civilisation: The Carnavalesque in Eighteenth-Century English Culture and Fiction* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1986), p. 6.

527. Wortman, *Scenarios of Power*, p. 5.

In her *Mémoires*, Catherine II noted that two masquerades were held on a weekly basis during the autumn and winter following her marriage in 1745, one held at Court and the other by a member of the St Petersburg elite.⁵²⁸ Catherine's description of these occasions gives the impression that, although the participants appeared to be enjoying themselves, they were in fact quite boring affairs due to the rather formal atmosphere and the small number of guests. This modest level of participation created a problem of space since the Court masquerades, held in the Imperial palaces, seemed empty, whereas the 'principal houses' chosen to play host were not considered large enough.⁵²⁹ Leaving aside the question of Catherine's personal enjoyment of these occasions, there are few details in her description about where exactly these masquerades took place, making it difficult to verify her views on their relative sizes and the suitability of the houses used to host them. In the *Kamer-fur'erskie zhurnaly* for the period mentioned by Catherine, there is an entry for 15 September 1745 which includes a note to the *kamer-fur'er* Sergei Nesterov, setting out the weekly schedule for entertainments at Court for the coming months. These began with a *kurtag* on Sunday evenings, followed by an Italian *intermezzo* (presumably in the Court Opera house, though it is not specified) on Mondays, with specific mention of the manner in which women attending the theatre were to be dressed (*v kaftanakh podkolennykh*). Court masquerades were to be held on Tuesdays and French comedies were to be performed on Thursdays, again with the aforementioned dress stipulation for ladies.⁵³⁰ There is no mention of any other weekly masquerade and the subsequent entries make it clear that the focus of the Court's social life was on the Summer Palace, with the seasonal move to the Winter Palace on 30 September.⁵³¹

Interestingly, this note makes specific mention of a number of women who are to be invited to the Court masquerades, in addition to the usual Court gentlemen and

528. In an earlier draft of Catherine's *Mémoires*, she described these events as 'masked balls': Catherine II, *Zapiski*, p. 79 and *Memoirs* (tr. Anthony), p. 97. The later and fuller version of the *Mémoires*, dating to the mid 1790s, omitted much of the detail about these occasions and instead referred to them as 'masquerades': *Zapiski imperatitsy Ekateriny vtoroi*, p. 239 and *Memoirs* (tr. Cruse and Hoogenboom), p. 35.

529. There was more discussion of these issues in the earlier draft, in which Catherine noted the problems associated with both the masquerades and their venues: *Zapiski*, pp. 79-80 and *Memoirs* (tr. Anthony), p. 97. The later draft simply noted that the houses were 'very small': *Memoirs* (tr. Cruse and Hoogenboom), p. 35.

530. *KFZh*, 1745, p. 93 (15 September).

531. *KFZh*, 1745, pp. 94-101 (17-30 September).

ladies. Using a contemporary list of the first five Ranks and their families resident in St Petersburg, it is possible to draw out some details about these guests.⁵³² It begins with Ekaterina Mikhailovna (aged 19)⁵³³, the daughter of the *ober-gofmeisterina* Princess Tat'iana B. Golitsyna, followed by Princess Aleksandra I. Kurakina (aged 35) and her daughters, Anna (aged 14) and Tat'iana (aged 13)⁵³⁴, Mar'ia A. Naryshkina (aged 15)⁵³⁵, daughter of the Empress' cousin Aleksandr L'vovich (who had died in January of the same year), Mar'ia A. Rumiantseva's eldest daughter, Praskov'ia Aleksandrovna (aged 15)⁵³⁶, Lady Bredal⁵³⁷, and Princess Belosel'skaia (aged 35).⁵³⁸ Several factors may have been at work to explain the selection of these mainly young women to attend the Court masquerades. Firstly, the Court remained a largely male-dominated environment, certainly in terms of the *Generalitet* and the various Court officers. Consequently, when arranging social events, especially those at which there would be dancing or another form of interaction, the concern to ensure a reasonable turn-out of women would seem sensible. Secondly, there is the role of the Court as a social forum in which young women were able to gain valuable experience of social interaction and decorum when they were considered to have reached a suitable age. Such experience was equally as important for young men, and members of the Cadet Corps were encouraged to attend Court masquerades (discussed in Chapter Five below).

In addition, one of the functions of such forums, leaving aside their educational value, was to serve as a way for young men and women of the nobility to meet one another with a view to marriage. Petrine legislation had removed some of the enforced nature of traditional marriage arrangements and the new social gatherings, for members of the elite at least, allowed prospective couples to meet and interact prior to any engagement. It is also important to remember that Catherine was still only 16 at the time

532. *RGADA*, f. 16, op. 1, d. 443, ll. 176-184ob (n.d.). NB. although the document carries no date, the ages listed for the various people make it clear that it was compiled at some point in 1747.

533. *Siiatel'nye zheny: biografii i rodoslovnaia stats-dam i freilin russkogo dvora, po spiskam P. F. Karabanova*, ed. and comp. by V. P. Parkhomenko (St Petersburg: A. S. Suvorin, 1992), p. 23.

534. Although Aleksandra Ivanovna had six daughters in total, I have chosen the two eldest daughters as being the most likely to be old enough to be allowed to attend Court events: *RGADA*, f. 16, op. 1, d. 443, l. 181.

535. *Siiatel'nye zheny*, p. 52.

536. *Siiatel'nye zheny*, p. 23.

537. Precise information is difficult to locate on Lady Bredal', since she did not hold a Court position. She appears to have been the wife of Vice-Admiral Petr Bredal' and is listed at other Court events in 1745, such as the Grand Duke and Duchess' wedding - *KFZh*, 1745, p. 60 (21 August).

538. *RGADA*, f. 16, op. 1, d. 443, l. 181ob.

and the fact that the majority of these guests were of a similar age suggests that there may have been some recognition of the need to make allowances for a 'younger' Court, which would gradually emerge around Peter and Catherine as Grand Duke and Duchess in the early 1750s. The fact that these masquerades were intended for the Court is highlighted by an *ukaz* to the Police Chancellery on the day following the note to Nesterov included in the *Kamer-fur'erskii zhurnal*. This includes the same details of Court entertainments for the coming weeks, with the exception of the masquerades on Tuesdays, which were clearly not intended for wider participation.⁵³⁹ From that point onwards, the official record kept of Court events in both the *Kamer-fur'erskii* and *Pridvornyi zhurnal* for 1745 indicates that all masquerades and balls were held in the Court's main palaces, until the first mention of a *publichnyi maskarad* in early January 1746 (see below).

Further details of the events described by Catherine are provided by the records of the Court Office. On 10 January 1746, Elizabeth issued an *ukaz* which ordered masquerades to be held in the St Petersburg houses of prominent nobles (*osoby*) on Mondays, Wednesdays and Thursdays, beginning on 13 January and lasting until Shrovetide (*Syrnaia nedel'ia*).⁵⁴⁰ Attendance was extended to the *Generalitet* and to others living in St Petersburg, presumably meaning the nobility. The guests were to gather at the intended venue at 5pm, although no indication is given as to the exact starting time - in practice, proceedings would only get under way upon the Empress's arrival. The role of the owner of the house used for the occasion was mentioned in the *ukaz*:

... а хозяевам объявить чтоб были в маскарадном платье а гостей не встречали и не провожали...

In other words, the house owner had to be present and dressed appropriately, but there was no requirement for them to act as a formal 'host' for the evening. This is reminiscent of the section in the 1718 *ukaz* on *assamblei*, which stated that the owner of the house in which they were held did not have to be present for the occasion, but instead simply had to make the arrangements for his guests' refreshment and entertainment.⁵⁴¹ Similarly, the 1746 *ukaz* stipulated several elements of the evening's

539. *RGIA*, f. 1329, op. 2, d. 39, l. 15 (16 September 1745).

540. *RGIA*, f. 1329, op. 2, d. 40, l. 1.

541. *PSZ*, vol. V, no. 3241 (26 November 1718), p. 598. For further discussion of the *assamblei*, see

entertainment which the house owner was responsible for organising on behalf of the guests:

... и чтоб за столами где кушанье поставлено будет стульев не было
так ж карты и музыка в покоях была...

The lack of chairs implies that the provision of food at these events was to take the form of a buffet, rather than a formal evening meal. However, the entries for these masquerades in the *Kamer-fur'erskie zhurnaly*, with the exception of that on 27 January at Count Aleksandr I. Rumiantsev's house, all mention that there was an evening meal (*vechernee kushan'e*).⁵⁴² Although it is possible that this phrase referred to the buffet accompaniment to the masquerade, it seems more likely that the host would invite the Empress and other members of her party - the Grand Duke, the Grand Duchess and Prince August of Holstein - to dine after the masquerade had finished and the guests had dispersed.⁵⁴³

On 12 January 1746, the Police Chancellery issued the *ukaz*, together with the register which contained the names of the dignitaries chosen by the Empress, through the Court Office, to host the masquerades and the dates on which they would be held. This programme began with members of the first Rank, General-Fieldmarshal Ivan Iu. Trubetskoi (on 13 January) and Chancellor Aleksei P. Bestuzhev-Riumin (on 16 January), with General Count Andrei I. Ushakov (on 15 January) between them, followed by other members of the second Rank. The list included prominent members of the Court, such as the *ober-gofmarshal* Dmitrii A. Shepelev (on 6 February) and the *ober-egermeister* Aleksei G. Razumovskii (on 4 February), and the civil administration, such as Prince Nikita Iu. Trubetskoi, the *ober-prokuror* of the Senate (on 27 January) and Prince Boris G. Iusupov, the head of the Commerce College (on 8 February). The host was clearly not an essential figure during these evenings: the list also included the late Aleksandr L. Naryshkin (on 29 January), no doubt on account of his house.⁵⁴⁴

A contemporary view of these masquerades can be found in a letter from Count Aleksei Bestuzhev-Riumin to Count Mikhail L. Vorontsov on 23 January 1746:

Chapter One.

542. *KFZh*, 1746, pp. 12-36 (13 January - 8 February).

543. Note that none of the Court records or personal accounts of these occasions gives any indication of the menu or the guest list, and so this is purely a suggestion on my part.

544. *RGADA*, f. 14, op. 1, d. 95, l. 1-1ob.

Ныне у нас карневал и маскарадные забавы, на основании тех, кои при жизни Его Императорскаго Величества блаженные и вечно достойныя памяти Государя Петра Великаго были, начались таким образом, что в домах первого и второго классов оныя в учрежденные к тому дни держатся, и где Наша Всемиловитейшая Государыня Самодержица, со всею Своею Высочайшею Императорскою Фамилею и придворным штатом всегда находится изволит, к чему весь генералитет и знатное шляхетство равномерно ж приглашаются, так что от трех до четырех сот масок вместе бывает.⁵⁴⁵

This admittedly brief account contains several important points. Firstly, it acknowledged the important role of the social gatherings introduced under Peter I, particularly (although not named) the *assamblei* insofar as they were held in noble houses, in establishing this type of elite entertainment. Secondly, it provides some basic details about the status of the guests and some indication of the numbers involved. If one considers the figure of three to four hundred people alongside the requirement for the host to provide at least three rooms, one main room for dancing, another for dining and a third (probably smaller) for playing cards, then the strain on the available space in even the larger houses of the city's elite is understandable. It also explains Catherine's views (discussed above) on the rather cramped nature of these events.

The distinction between 'Court' and 'public' masquerades was briefly mentioned later in Catherine's *Mémoires*. In the section where she discusses the Court's social activities during 1750, she noted that two evenings a week were set aside for masquerades. One of these evenings was only for the Court and specially-invited guests of the Empress, whilst the other evening was for all persons of rank (in the Russian translation, this is rendered as *sanovnye litsa*), from colonel (equivalent to Rank VI on the Table of Ranks) upwards, as well as officers from the Guards regiments. She then adds that sometimes these occasions are opened to all of the nobility and the most distinguished merchants.⁵⁴⁶ The first masquerade which is actually described as 'public' in the *Kamer-fur'erskie Zhurnaly* took place on 8 January 1746 in the hall of the Winter Palace. The Empress, Grand Duke Peter and his wife, and Prince August of Holstein were joined by the Court gentlemen, the *Generalitet*, foreign ministers, and the

545. *Arkhiv Vorontsova*, vol. II, pp. 142-43.

546. Catherine II, *Zapiski*, p. 309.

‘distinguished’ nobility (*znatnoe dvorianstvo*) with their families.⁵⁴⁷ It is not made clear in the entry for this event why the term *publichnyi* has been applied, rather than the usual *pridvornyi*, nor is it clear in relation to the participants.

However, within a few years, there was a much clearer example of the use of *publichnyi* in relation to such events. Early in 1748, a series of ‘public’ masquerades was held in the Opera house, organised by the French comic actor Serigny, importantly with the Empress’ approval. They were referred to in the *Kamer-fur’erskii zhurnal* using the phrase *publichnyi vol’noi maskarad*, and the entry for the first of this series provides several important details. Tickets could be bought either in advance from Serigny or at the door on the evening itself. The masquerade was open to anyone who paid two roubles for a ticket and was wearing a mask, although prominent noble families (referred to as *liudi boiarskie*) did not have to worry about the latter requirement. The description of the preparations for the masquerade mentions that Serigny had to produce the necessary tickets and *ob’’iavitel’nye listy* in Russian and French at his own cost (*na ego kosht*), which were to be printed at the Academy of Sciences press. These *listy* were probably similar to the *afisha* used to announce theatrical performances, and the description notes that they were intended to publicise the event (*v narod*).⁵⁴⁸ The use of the word *vol’noi* to describe these masquerades is interesting since, although it may suggest a more informal atmosphere than similar Court events, there were clearly several social restraints in place. For example, there were two entrances to the Opera house, one which was to be used by the *znatnye persony* and other members of the nobility, and the other intended for everyone else. Similarly, during the masquerade, there was to be no dancing between members of these two groups, again ensuring a degree of separation.

Precautions were taken to ensure that quarrels (*ssory*) and impoliteness (*neuchtivstvo*) did not occur, with two *kamer-lakei* sent from the Court presumably to collect the tickets and ensure orderly conduct at the two entrances. In case of more serious problems, there was also a Guards detachment, consisting of a sergeant, three corporals and thirty soldiers.⁵⁴⁹ As refreshment for the patrons, Serigny had to provide

547. *KFZh*, 1746, p. 11 (8 January).

548. *KFZh*, 1748, p. 15 (11 February).

549. *KFZh*, 1748, pp. 15-16 (11 February).

(again at his own expense) tea, coffee, lemonade, chocolate, *orshad* (an almond-flavoured milk drink) and confectionary. It was specifically noted that neither vodka nor wine were served. Besides considerations of cost, this may have been motivated by concerns about the effect that alcohol could have on the behaviour and conduct of the patrons (a point raised already in Chapter Two). There was also no proper meal, as there usually was at Court masquerades after the dancing had finished. The reasons for this omission are not clear from the description, although again it could be linked both to the potential expense and the mixed social nature of the occasion, which would require separate dining areas. However the Empress, Grand Duke and Grand Duchess were able to dine in their boxes, with the meals prepared in the Court kitchens and then brought to the Opera house.⁵⁵⁰ This event is also mentioned in the *Zhurnaly dezhurnykh general-ad''iutantov*, where it was referred to simply as a *vol'noi maskarad*. The entry mentioned that the soldiers of the Guards were present to maintain order, who received their preliminary instructions from the *gof-marshal* Naryshkin and then, on the evening itself, were under the command of the officer in charge of the Court sentries, Captain Shubin of the Izmailovskii Guards regiment. It also noted that the Empress left the palace to attend this masquerade at 8pm and returned at 1am.⁵⁵¹

The event must have been successful, since the Empress, Grand Duke and Grand Duchess attended another such masquerade in the Opera house on 16 February, and then, whilst the Empress spent a night at Tsarskoe Selo, the Grand Duke and Duchess attended two further masquerades on consecutive evenings, all organised by Serigny. In each of these cases, the word *publichnyi* has been dropped from the description - they are now simply *vol'noi maskarad*.⁵⁵² When the Empress returned, she ordered another masquerade to be organised in the Opera house, on an evening that the Grand Duke and Duchess dined with the Chancellor, Aleksei Bestuzhev-Riumin. The *Kamer-fur'erskii zhurnal* entry for this event does not mention Serigny, nor does it use the terms *publichnyi* or *vol'noi*. This distinction is reflected in the groups invited to participate: 'distinguished' persons, the staff and senior officers of the Guards regiments, staff officers of the field regiments (stationed in St Petersburg), other military and civil 'officers' (with no mention of rank) and all 'distinguished' nobles (as above). These

550. *KFZh*, 1748, p. 15 (11 February).

551. *RGIA*, f. 439, op. 1, d. 2, ll. 24 (10 February 1748) and 25ob (11 February 1748).

552. *KFZh*, 1748, p. 19 (16, 18 and 19 February).

guests had their masks inspected at the doors of the Opera house by a Court *gof-fur'er* and a Guards officer.⁵⁵³ An important difference is that this masquerade included an evening meal, which was served on the stage of the Opera house, with the dancing confined to the main hall. The meal table was set for one hundred people, allowing a rough estimate of the number of guests involved.⁵⁵⁴

The fact that such a meal was held for this masquerade and not for the others, which were open to a paying public, again raises the question of the interaction between the two groups of guests. The light refreshments at the *publichnyi* masquerade made prolonged interaction between guests from the two broad social groups much less likely than at a proper meal. However, at the latter masquerade, the vast majority of the guests were from the nobility, thus the meal was no longer a potential source of controversy. The use of the stage in this case was due to the practical problems of accommodating a meal for so many guests in a space like the Opera house. However, such a setting also highlights the theatrical elements of the masquerade as an entertainment, not merely for its participants, but also as a spectacle. This was reinforced by the Empress, Grand Duke and Grand Duchess sitting in their boxes during the first masquerade, as if attending a performance.

The term *vol'noi* continues to appear with reference to masquerades throughout the next decade, although, as with the term *publichnyi*, it is not always readily apparent why it has been used. For example, in 1750, the *Zhurnaly dezhurnykh general-ad''iutantov* recorded that a *vol'noi* masquerade took place at Court for all of the nobility on 2 December.⁵⁵⁵ The *Kamer-fur'erskie zhurnaly* entry for the same evening noted that a masquerade had occurred 'by order of the Empress', as it would have usually happened on a Tuesday.⁵⁵⁶ This referred to an *ukaz* issued by the Empress at the end of September, which established a weekly Court masquerade on Tuesday evenings to continue until the Empress ordered differently - guests would be notified by *povestki* sent through Court servants.⁵⁵⁷ It is clear both from this *ukaz* and from the entries for subsequent weeks that these masquerades were attended by the ladies and gentlemen of

553. *KFZh*, 1748, p. 20 (20 February). The entry in the *ZhDA* adds that foreign ministers were amongst the guests - *RGIA*, f. 439, op. 1, d. 2, l. 32 (20 February 1748).

554. *KFZh*, 1748, p. 19 (20 February).

555. *ZhDA*, 1750, p. 223 (2 December).

556. *KFZh*, 1750, pp. 145-46 (2 December).

557. *KFZh*, 1750, p. 108 (27 September).

the Court and the top ranks of the *Generalitet*, and so the use of the term *vol'noi* in the sentry books seems erroneous.

However, in the following year, a number of entries in both the sentry logbooks and the *Kamer-fur'erskii zhurnal* referred back to this masquerade in December 1750. For example, on 1 January, there is a report dealing with an *ukaz* issued on 12 December, in which the Empress ordered a 'public' (*publichnyi*) masquerade to be held to celebrate her birthday on 18 December. This was to be:

против того, каков того-ж декабря 2-го числа при дворе ея
императорскаго величества маскарад был...

This particular masquerade had to be cancelled and instead rearranged for 2 January, hence the inclusion of the *ukaz* in the sentry journal. The order continued that this meant that access or entry (*priezd*) was granted to all Court and 'distinguished' persons, foreign ministers, and the whole nobility with their families (although not very young children), providing they were wearing decent (*prilichnyi*) masks and none of the prohibited clothing or jewellery. Entry was controlled by tickets, which were distributed by the Court Office, and those officers wishing to attend applied through their regiments. Two senior officers and six junior officers were in charge of admission.⁵⁵⁸ Importantly, in the entry for 2 January itself, this event is described as a *vol'noi maskarad*.⁵⁵⁹

The entry in the *Kamer-fur'erskii zhurnal* confirms the details of the invited guests as well as stating the clothing requirements, although using the word *pristoinyi*, rather than *prilichnyi*, to describe the masks. However, it also mentions the tickets issued by the Court Office in greater detail, revealing that only 111 tickets were distributed to those wishing to attend and adding that people arriving at Court in masquerade dress could collect tickets from two places by the entrance doors. This was clearly the case in many instances, since the number of participants is later given as 665 people (including the families of the nobility).⁵⁶⁰ One reason for this may have been the fact that many of those invited guests were already familiar with the process of attending such events and were of a sufficient rank that a ticket was considered

558. *ZhDA*, 1751, p. 225 (1 January).

559. *ZhDA*, 1751, p. 225 (2 January).

560. *KFZh*, 1751, pp. 6 and 8 (2 January).

unnecessary. Another possible reason may relate to the nature of the tickets themselves - if they were distributed to gentlemen from the nobility in general, and each of these gentlemen was accompanied by his wife and possibly a son or daughter, then it would explain the sizeable difference between the number of tickets and the actual number of participants. The masquerade began at 8.30pm and lasted until 7.30am, with the dancing punctuated by an evening meal at 1am. This meal meant that the guests were divided into two main groups. The first and second ranks of the *Generalitet*, the ladies and gentlemen of the Court, and the foreign guests dined with the Grand Duke and Duchess in their *stolovaia* at two specially-prepared tables. The rest of the guests dined at three tables in the second and third ceremonial (*paradnye*) rooms from the main hall, where the dancing was held. It is noted that this was a cold meal. Throughout the masquerade, pages circulated with a selection of drinks (including tea, coffee, lemonade and 'various') and confectionary for the guests.⁵⁶¹

An order from the *Pridvornaia kontora* in 1751 on the weekly Court masquerades reveals three important areas for comparison with the *publichnyi* masquerades. Firstly, **when** the event is due to take place: in this case, on the Tuesday of every week, no time is stipulated. Secondly, **who** is to be invited: in this case, members of the first two classes of the *Generalitet*, with their wives (but not their children), as well as the members of the Empress's Court. These were the *ober-gofmeisterina*, *gofmeisterina*, *stats-damy*, *kamer-freilina*, *freiliny* and Court *kavalery*. The order notes that, unless these *kavalery* fall into one of the above two *Generalitet* classes, they are not allowed to bring their wives. A side-note mentions that the wife of the Saxon ambassador is to be included as well. Thirdly, and closely associated with the second point, **what** they are to wear: in this case, masquerade dress. The *ukaz* goes on to stipulate that the *gof-shtap-kvartirmeister* and the *kamer-fur'er* are to be responsible for sending out notification (*povestki*) to the relevant people on the eve of the masquerade. Then the *ober-gofmarshal* and *gofmarshal* are given a register of people who have been invited so that guests can be checked at the masquerade itself.⁵⁶²

It is interesting to note the differences between this document and one that follows closely afterwards in the same month. This details public (*publichnye*)

561. *KFZh*, 1751, pp. 7-8 (2 January).

562. *RGIA*, f. 466, op. 1, d. 84, l. 3 (9 January 1751).

masquerades at Court from Friday 18th January and then (presumably) weekly until Lent. A direct reference is made to similar masquerades held on 2nd December 1750 and 2nd January 1751, which the whole nobility, explicitly mentioning both Russian and foreign, along with their families (although not very young children) were allowed to attend. Non-nobles were not allowed (literally, would not dare) to attend.⁵⁶³ The *Kamer-fur'erskii zhurnal* entry for this masquerade distinguishes two main groups amongst the prospective guests: 'distinguished' persons, which includes the foreign ministers at Court, and the nobility with their families.⁵⁶⁴ Entrance was controlled by tickets, which had to be ordered from the Court Office. This appears to have served two purposes: to ensure that the Court knew the number of people attending for organisational purposes and also to draw up the register noted in the *ukaz* above. The latter point is important, since the *ukaz* stressed that those who ordered tickets and then did not use them were to be fined, making use of the register to check names.⁵⁶⁵

The *Kamer-fur'erskii zhurnal* entry bears this out, since it notes that, although 867 tickets were given out, only 637 people attended the masquerade. A note was made in the margin of this paragraph, which read '*V Akademiiu pokazano do 1000 person*'.⁵⁶⁶ The reason for this was given in a similar addition in the margin beside the entry for the masquerade on 2 January, stating '*V Akademiiu, dlia napechataniia v gazety, pokazano do 1500 person*'.⁵⁶⁷ Both of these notes raise questions about the reporting of the event in the *Vedomosti*, an important means of describing these occasions to a wider 'public' which will be discussed in Chapter Five. The dress requirements for this masquerade are considered appropriate or decent masks (again *prilichnyi* in the *ukaz* and *pristoinyi* in the *Kamer-fur'erskii zhurnal* entry), and attending in pilgrim, harlequin or indecent (*nepristoinyi*) rural costumes was specifically prohibited. Similarly cheap or tawdry fripperies and glass jewellery are not allowed, and weaponry (in this case, not specified) would be punished by a fine.⁵⁶⁸ The *ukaz* finishes with an order to *kamer-fur'er* Nesterov to amend the list of those who were to be admitted, which was to be given to the *gof-fur'ery* on the doors, who were responsible for checking the guests and their

563. *RGIA*, f. 466, op. 1, d. 84, l. 6 (15 January 1751).

564. *KFZh*, 1751, p. 15 (18 January).

565. *RGIA*, f. 466, op. 1, d. 84, l. 6 - 6ob (15 January 1751).

566. *KFZh*, 1751, p. 15 (18 January).

567. *KFZh*, 1751, p. 6-8 (2 January).

568. *RGIA*, f. 466, op. 1, d. 84, l. 6 (15 January 1751).

masks. These amendments were based on an order given to Nesterov by the Empress on 31 December, possibly relating to the masquerade which was held on 2 January.⁵⁶⁹

Another *ukaz* for a ‘public’ masquerade on 8 February, which is otherwise identical to the 18th January example, differs in two important ways. Firstly, amongst those able to attend, there is mention of ‘all distinguished ranks’ (*vse znatnye chiny*) in addition to the Russian and foreign nobility, with their families. As discussed above, in this context the use of the term *znatnyi* was intended to draw attention to a specific social group within the elite, probably the top ranks of the *Generalitet*, already mentioned in the Court masquerade *ukaz* from 9 January.⁵⁷⁰ This is borne out by the details given in the description of the event in the *Kamer-fur’erskie Zhurnaly*.⁵⁷¹ Secondly, the punishment for non-nobles attempting to attend the masquerade was dealt with in slightly more detail, with specific mention of a fine. Thirdly, the importance of the numbers of people intending to attend is given a more practical nature through the mention of an evening meal after the masquerade, at 1am. Whereas in the above *ukaz*, the concern revolved primarily around drinks and confectionary, in this case, a meat course had to be provided.⁵⁷² The distinction to be made between the two groups at a public masquerade is more explicit in another *ukaz* from later in the same year, as part of the celebrations for the anniversary of Elizabeth’s coronation. The masquerade was to take place in the gallery and ceremonial chambers of the Winter palace, and there was to be a meal afterwards. However, the ‘distinguished’ persons were to dine in the hall, whereas the non-distinguished ranks (*sostoiashchie ne v znatnykh rangakh*) and the rest of the nobility were to dine in the newly-built entrance chambers, situated opposite the hall.⁵⁷³ Therefore, a physical as well as descriptive distinction was drawn between these two groups, despite the fact that both were considered nobility.

Masquerades provide another important example of the use of the term *publichnyi* to apply to a social event which was initially restricted to members of the Court elite, but was subsequently extended to include the wider nobility and other distinguished members of St Petersburg’s population. There was a clear sense of regulation in the

569. *RGIA*, f. 466, op. 1, d. 84, l. 7 (15 January 1751).

570. *RGIA*, f. 466, op. 1, d. 84, l. 14 (5 February 1751).

571. *KFZh*, 1751, p. 31 (8 February).

572. *RGIA*, f. 466, op. 1, d. 84, l. 14 (5 February 1751).

573. *RGIA*, f. 466, op. 1, d. 84, l. 50 (23 April 1751).

instructions issued by the Court Office, particularly in relation to the manner of the guests' clothing and accessories. Nevertheless, access to these events had an impact on the wider social life of the city and the emergence of 'public' masquerades for a paying audience, in a manner similar to the 'public' theatre performances, was significant in this respect. Along with both the theatre and the dance evenings organised for various social groups in the same period, discussed above, the wider inhabitants of St Petersburg were encouraged to socialise in a manner similar to the elite.

The Imperial Gardens and the Question of Accessibility

One of the more informal activities in which the European social elite indulged was strolling in an urban setting. Later in the eighteenth century, Nevskii Prospekt would become the main avenue for informal strolling in St Petersburg. However, earlier in the century, properly paved, safe areas in which to stroll, to see and be seen by social peers, were more restricted. One of these was Imperial Gardens in St Petersburg, which were an important feature of the city's landscape, already discussed in Chapter One, but were an area largely reserved for the members of the Imperial family and the members of their personal retinues. One could take the example of an entry made by Captain Shubin of the Semenovskii Guards in the *Zhurnaly dezhurnykh general-ad''iutantov*, which included a register of the positions of and instructions to sentries on the eve of the Empress's move to the Summer Palace in May 1748, as well as referring to instructions already established for certain posts. There were the standard sentry posts at both the 'new' Rastrelli Summer Palace, beside the Moika river, and the 'old' Petrine Summer Palace, which restricted access to the apartments of the Imperial family and service areas, such as the kitchens. There were also guards at the entrances to the gardens, like the gates by the *Partikuliarnyi verf* on the Fontanka river, and at different points throughout the gardens, such as the 'grotto' where the Empress and her guests (Aleksei Razumovskii was named in this particular entry) would dine together.⁵⁷⁴

The bridge across the canal which separated the Summer Gardens from Tsaritsyn Meadow was permanently manned by a corporal and two soldiers from one of the Guards regiments, since it controlled access not only to the Summer Gardens but also to the Opera house. The Guards regiments also provided a sentry patrol for the gardens

574. *ZhDA*, 1748, pp. 70-71 (1 May).

themselves, consisting of a junior officer, two corporals and twenty soldiers.⁵⁷⁵ The instructions issued to such sentries depended on the occasion and the register included in the above entry for May 1748 simply set out the standard procedure. Those who had official business at Court would be issued with a special ticket or seal to allow them to pass the sentries. For example, in 1748, such tickets were issued to the priests, deacons and psalm-readers serving at Court so they could move between the ‘old’ and ‘new’ Summer Palaces.⁵⁷⁶

Further orders had to be issued for Court events at the Summer Palace or involving the gardens. For example, the first five ranks of the *Generalitet*, foreign ministers and the nobility with their families (excluding young children) were invited to attend a ‘public’ masquerade in the ‘new’ Summer Palace in May 1755. However, whilst the members of the *Generalitet* were instructed to enter the Summer Palace in the usual manner, the other guests were to come through the Summer Gardens. From Tsaritsyn Meadow, they were to enter the Summer Gardens using the bridge across the canal by the Opera house, where they would have their tickets checked by a *kamer-lakei* and a detachment of troops from the Guards regiments. They were then to proceed through the gardens as far as the Moika river and use the lower entrance, on the left-hand side of the Summer Palace.⁵⁷⁷ For this particular event, the same information which was included in the *povestki* sent out to the ladies and gentlemen of the Court was also entered in the *Zhurnaly dezhurnykh general-ad''iutantov*, which would then have been passed on to the officers in charge of the Guards detachment at the bridge by the Opera house and also the sentries patrolling the gardens themselves, to avoid any confusion with the guests.⁵⁷⁸

During the reign of Elizabeth, there was a move toward allowing wider access to these gardens. This access was mediated by a number of important criteria, which provide further evidence of the Empress’s strict requirements for the participation of a larger group of people in social arenas (as with social events, discussed above) which had been previously only been accessible by a small elite within the upper echelons of

575. Pisarenko, *Povsednevnaia zhizn' russkogo dvora*, p. 151. This appears to be drawn from the details of the *prikaz* issued to the captain in charge of these sentries on 10 May 1755 (see below).

576. *ZhDA*, 1748, p. 76 (19 May). This also notes that the tickets had already been issued on 4 and 18 May.

577. *KFZh*, 1755, pp. 56-58 (17 and 21 May).

578. *RGIA*, f. 439, op. 1, d. 10, ll. 43-43ob (17 May 1755).

Russian society. The *Kamer-fur'erskie zhurnaly* mention a written communication (*pis'mennoe soobshchenie*) was sent to the Office for Ceremonial Affairs in May 1750 stating that the ambassador from the Habsburg Empire was to be allowed to stroll in the Empress's garden (it is not specified which one), adding that this had been permitted to previous ambassadors.⁵⁷⁹ It is not clear solely from this entry if this diplomatic privilege was only open to Habsburg ministers. However, an entry in the *Zhurnaly dezhurnykh general-ad''iutantov* from July of the same year throws an interesting light on the issue of accessibility to the gardens. An order to Major Gur'ev of the Life Guards stated that it had been made known to the Empress that foreign ministers and members of the *Generalitet* were not being allowed to walk in the Imperial gardens. As a result, the Empress ordered that any foreign minister, member of the *Generalitet* or other distinguished (*znatnye*) persons wishing to stroll in the Summer Gardens should be allowed to do so, but that 'common' (*podlye*) people should be firmly excluded.⁵⁸⁰

From the evidence of these two entries, it would seem that certain privileged groups had previously been allowed to make use of the Summer Gardens for strolling but that this practice had lapsed, either through a lack of use or by mistake. Given the relative dates of the two entries and the fact that the case of the Habsburg ambassador was addressed in a written communication, it may indicate that it was an error which, when realised, was corrected. Also, as will be discussed below, it is also significant that the second entry was made during a period when Elizabeth and her Court were resident at Peterhof and thus not making regular use of the Summer Gardens. Access to the gardens was further extended in late May 1752, a month after the Empress had made her annual move from the Winter Palace to her 'new' Summer Palace.⁵⁸¹ An *ukaz* from Petr I. Shuvalov, the Empress's *dezhurnyi general-ad''iutant*, to the Police Chancellery ordered that 'subjects' (*poddannye*) of the Empress, foreign dignitaries (*inostrannye znatnye persony*) and other selected groups (see below), with their families, should be allowed access to the first and second gardens by the Neva river on Sundays and holidays (*torzhestvennye dni*) in order to 'stroll' (*guliat*). The various groups were listed in some detail, beginning with the junior officers, corporals and grenadiers of the Life Company, followed by the staff officers and senior officers of the Life Guards and

579. *KFZh*, 1750, pp. 58-59 (22 May).

580. *ZhDA*, 1750, p. 208 (1 July).

581. *KFZh*, 1752, p. 34 (28 April).

army regiments, the Cadet Corps, the Artillery and Engineering Corps, and the Navy. The list continued with civil ranks, equivalent to military officers (*sostoiaishchiia v rangakh ofiterskikh* - no rank or definition was given beyond that), and all of the nobility, without exception (*bez iz'iatii*).

It then moved on to non-noble social groups, principally Russian and foreign merchants and, perhaps reflecting Elizabeth's social experiences during the reign of her father, foreign naval personnel. Foreign ship's captains were included, as were other members of the crew, named as *morskii sluzhiteli*, but common sailors (*matrozy*) were specifically excluded, which indicates that these *sluzhiteli* were probably senior crew members.⁵⁸² The *ukaz* then continued with a requirement for the aforementioned people to be appropriately dressed, according to their rank or status (*v pristoinykh s ikh zvaniem plat'iakh*), in order to be allowed into the gardens. Ladies were not allowed to enter if they wore clothing considered inappropriate for the setting, such as domestic headwear (*v chepchikakh*) or dresses without the underframes (*ne v fizhmennyykh iupkakh*). The merchantry were not to have beards or 'untidy' hair (*v borodakh i raspretannykh volosakh*), where the latter may refer to the lack of a wig or appropriate styling for one's natural hair. Under no circumstances were liveried servants or any kind of serfs (referred to as *kholopy*) to be allowed into the gardens, nor were they allowed to accompany any member of the permitted groups mentioned above, with the threat of punishment (*nakazanie*) specifically stated, rather than the fines mentioned in connection with transgressions at Court events. The *ukaz* was to be published and sent to the Police Chancellery, who would inform those concerned.⁵⁸³

The first thing to note about this *ukaz* is the considerable increase in both the number and type of people who were granted access to the gardens in comparison with earlier examples, which appear to have been either on an occasional basis, or in response to an individual query (as may have been the case with the Habsburg minister). Alongside the highest ranks of the Russian elite and foreign ambassadors, from 1752, the gardens could be used at least once per week by both members of the nobility and their families, including the senior officers of all branches of the military and the civil service, and select non-noble groups, like the merchantry and ship captains. There can

582. *RGIA*, f. 1329, op. 2, d. 44, l. 13 (25 May 1752).

583. *RGIA*, f. 1329, op. 2, d. 44, ll. 13-13ob (25 May 1752). The *ukaz* is not included in the *PSZ* for this year.

be little doubt, both in terms of actual numbers and the activity of ‘strolling’ itself, that the wider nobility were the intended beneficiaries of this privileged access. Following this *ukaz*, wider access to the Imperial gardens does not feature in either the Court journals or in the orders issued by the Court Office, although the *Zhurnaly dezhurnykh general-ad’iutantov* continue to feature instructions to sentries when the Empress is resident in the ‘new’ Summer Palace and if there was an event in either the Summer Palace or the Gardens.

However, in May 1755, again shortly after the Empress’ move from the Winter Palace to her ‘new’ Summer Palace, the Empress ordered the Court Office to inform the Guards captain in charge of the sentries that on Thursday of every week, foreign ministers, members of the *Generalitet* (present in St Petersburg) and other persons of ‘every rank/status’ (*prochikh vsiakogo zvaniia*) were to be allowed to ‘stroll’ in the first and second gardens. This was possible only if they were dressed in a clean and tidy manner (*vo vsiakoi chistote i opriatnosti*). It then goes on to stipulate what is considered untidy, and therefore unsuitable, dress - tousled hair (as the merchantry were warned in 1752), ‘our’ (meaning traditional Russian) shawls, military-style boots (*sapogi*), grey (meaning undyed, coarse Russian cloth) kaftans for men, simple and traditional Russian dresses (*v prostom i v russkom plat’e*) for women.⁵⁸⁴ Liveried servants were still forbidden from the gardens. A special mention was made of the Habsburg ambassador, who was permitted to make use of these two gardens whenever he wished (*kogda on pozhelaet*). This privilege was also extended to the members of his entourage, namely his gentlemen and their attendant pages, although this still did not include their servants. Entrance to the gardens for all of these groups was controlled by stating that access was by means of the canal bridge at the Opera house, with its permanent Guards sentry.⁵⁸⁵ The same information was also sent to the ladies and gentlemen of the Court, the Main Police Chancellery and the Office of Ceremonial Affairs, with the latter responsible for informing the various foreign diplomats, especially the Habsburg ambassador in this case.⁵⁸⁶

584. *RGIA*, f. 439, op. 1, d. 10, l. 37ob (10 May 1755). On the use of the word ‘simple’ (*prostoi*) to describe a woman’s dress, Pisarenko believes that it is used to refer to one which does not have the underframe (*fizhma* or *fizhbein*), which was noted in the 1752 *ukaz*, discussed above: Pisarenko, *Povsednevnaia zhizn’ russkogo dvora*, p. 151.

585. *RGIA*, f. 439, op. 1, d. 10, l. 38 (10 May 1755).

586. *KFZh*, 1755, pp. 54-55 (10 May).

This *ukaz* is immediately followed in the *Zhurnaly dezhurnykh general-ad''iutantov* by the *prikaz* sent to Guards Captain Vatkovskii, who was in charge of these sentries, on the same day. This is virtually identical to the *ukaz* sent to the Court Office, except for some of the details in the clothing stipulations. For example, a note about merchants with beards was included (similar to that from the *ukaz* of 1752) and the nature of the prohibited *prostoi* dresses was made more explicit by specifically mentioning the absence of the requisite underframes (*fizhmennye iubki*).⁵⁸⁷ The fact that the merchantry were mentioned in this *prikaz*, although they were not named in the original *ukaz*, indicates that they were still considered to be amongst the general group of people of 'every rank/status'. A similar *ukaz* was issued from the Court Office the following month in which the same people, with the same dress stipulations, were granted access to the first, second and third Summer Gardens on both Thursdays and Sundays.⁵⁸⁸ This *ukaz* also appeared in the *Kamerfur'erskie Zhurnaly*, including details of the people allowed to 'stroll' in these gardens and their required appearance, all of which was again sent to the ladies and gentlemen of the Court, the Main Police Chancellery and the Office of Ceremonial Affairs, on the same basis as 10 May.⁵⁸⁹ Likewise the entry in the *Zhurnaly dezhurnykh general-ad''iutantov* referred back to the *prikaz* of 10 May for the same details.⁵⁹⁰ The inclusion of the third Imperial gardens coincided with the departure of the Empress and her Court to stay in Peterhof on the following day, while the Grand Duke and Duchess had already left St Petersburg to stay at Oranienbaum. When the Empress returned to St Petersburg early on 3 August, a *prikaz* was sent to Guards Captain Ashcherin, then head of the sentries, by which access to the third Imperial gardens was no longer allowed on Thursdays and Sundays (although the first and second gardens were still open on those days). This seems to indicate that the third Gardens were still largely the domain of the Imperial family.⁵⁹¹

The effect of the presence of the Empress in St Petersburg was given a more explicit form in 1756. An *ukaz* from the Empress's *dezhurnyi general-ad''iutant* Ivan Buturlin to the Main Police Chancellery in May 1756 stated that access to the first and

587. *RGIA*, f. 439, op. 1, d. 10, l. 38 (10 May 1755).

588. *RGIA*, f. 1329, op. 2, d. 47, l. 29 (17 June 1755).

589. *KFZh*, 1755, p. 66 (16 June).

590. *RGIA*, f. 439, op. 1, d. 10, l. 54 (17 June 1755).

591. *KFZh*, 1755, p. 73 (3 August) and *RGIA*, f. 439, op. 1, d. 10, l. 64ob (3 August 1755).

second Imperial gardens was granted on Thursdays of every week when the Empress was present in St Petersburg, and on Thursdays and Sundays of every week when she was not present. The *ukaz* included all of the groups of people previously mentioned in the example above from May 1752, that is to say from both noble and non-noble social groups, and the prohibited groups were listed as ordinary sailors, personal serfs and common people. The dress stipulations were the same as those from 1755.⁵⁹² However, the *ukaz* then goes on to state that the first two ranks of the *Generalitet* and foreign ambassadors, especially those of the Habsburg Empire, England and Sweden (specifically named as Count Horn), along with their entourage and one page, were permitted to make use of the first and second gardens on the above days whenever they wished. Finally, it is noted that the ladies and gentlemen of the Empress's Court would continue to have their usual privileged access, a detail which had not previously been noted in these *ukazy*.⁵⁹³ The privileged nature of this smaller group was confirmed by a further *ukaz* in June 1756, when the Empress ordered that foreign ministers and members of the *Generalitet* from the rank of brigadier upwards were to be granted access to the third Imperial gardens on Thursdays and Sundays.⁵⁹⁴ With the issuing of these *ukazy*, a deliberate divide was established within the social groups who were allowed to 'stroll' in the first and second Imperial gardens, dependent on the Empress's presence in St Petersburg, and those who could make use of any of the three Imperial gardens on both of the selected days. The inclusion of the third Imperial gardens, previously kept closed for use by the Imperial family when they were in St Petersburg, was an important step towards creating this smaller and more select group, which consisted of the same people as attended other selective Court events, such as *kurtagi*.

The access granted to the Summer Gardens for a number of social groups, albeit with strict limitations on entry still in place, was an important step in the development of strolling as a social pursuit. This was later reflected in the opening of other, previously private gardens to wider access. For example, in June 1759, the gardens of the Cadet Corps were opened on Thursdays and Sundays, with only liveried servants

592. *RGIA*, f. 1329, op. 2, d. 48, ll. 16-16ob (24 May 1756).

593. *RGIA*, f. 1329, op. 2, d. 48, l. 16ob (24 May 1756). NB. this is also the first *ukaz* regarding access to the Imperial gardens to appear in the *PSZ*, vol. XIV, no. 10560 (24 May 1756).

594. *RGIA*, f. 1329, op. 2, d. 48, l. 19 (19 June 1756). See also *PSZ*, vol. XIV, no. 10573 (19 June 1756).

and inappropriately dressed individuals refused entry.⁵⁹⁵ A related development, albeit beyond the scope of this thesis, was the emergence of pleasure gardens, or ‘vauxhalls’ after the English inspiration, which were opened in St Petersburg by foreign entrepreneurs for a paying public from the 1780s onwards.⁵⁹⁶

Everyday Social Life of the Elite

To discuss in detail the everyday life of the public is beyond the scope of our investigation. However, the case study of the visit of Prince Karl of Saxony, son of King August III of Poland, in the late 1750s reveals some interesting information on how the upper echelons spent their days. Elizabeth summoned Karl to St Petersburg in the spring of 1758 with a view to supporting him as a candidate for the duchy of Courland. This initial visit to St Petersburg was noted in the entries of the official *Kamer-fur'erskie zhurnaly* for that year, although very few details were given. However it was also discussed in both the *Mémoires* of Catherine II and the notes of Louis Alexandre Frotier, comte de la Messelière, who was a member of the French diplomatic staff in St Petersburg between 1757-59.⁵⁹⁷ These two accounts enable us to fill in some details about his stay which are not present in the official account. Karl was housed in Ivan Shuvalov's house on Sadovaia ulitsa, the decor of which Catherine described as expensive, but tasteless. For example, she noted that Shuvalov owned many paintings but that they were mostly copies.⁵⁹⁸ *Kamerger* Count Ivan Chernyshev was assigned to accompany Karl during his stay in St Petersburg and a Guards battalion were detailed to act as sentries at Shuvalov's house. In addition, Karl was provided with Court personnel to prepare and serve his meals.⁵⁹⁹

What is certainly clear from both the official and personal accounts of Prince Karl's visit is that he was treated very well by the Empress. In terms of the official record of Court events, he is listed alongside Grand Duke Peter in the seating list of

595. Smith, *Working the Rough Stone*, p. 68.

596. Pyliaev, *Staryi Peterburg*, pp. 432-35.

597. *KFZh*, 1758, pp. 50-107 (5 April - 5 July 1758); Catherine II, *Zapiski*, pp. 414-16; 'Zapiski g. de la Messel'era o prebyvanii ego v Rossii s maia 1757 po mart 1759 goda', *Russkii arkhiv*, 1 (1874), pp. 1001-10.

598. Catherine II, *Zapiski*, p. 415. Considering that Catherine later used Shuvalov as an agent to purchase art in Paris for her own collection, she evidently valued his eye for art over his taste in interior decor.

599. Catherine II, *Zapiski*, p. 415; 'Zapiski g. de la Messel'era', p. 1002.

distinguished guests for the banquet to celebrate Grand Duchess Catherine's birthday, Grand Duke Peter's nameday and the first *kurtag* of the season, with the latter two events held at Petergof.⁶⁰⁰ He is also mentioned amongst the guests at important ceremonial occasions, such as the anniversary of the Empress's coronation and the launch of a new ship.⁶⁰¹ He also joined the Empress in attending theatrical performances, in a similar manner to the Grand Duke or Duchess.⁶⁰² Messelière describes how Elizabeth was impressed by the prince's bearing and character, illustrating this with examples of the expensive gifts she gave to him. One particular episode took place on the eve of Karl's nameday, when Elizabeth sent 2500 gold 'imperials' to his room with a note, saying that Russia did not have the climate to produce flowers and asking him to accept this gift instead.⁶⁰³

The nameday itself, on 2 July, was celebrated in the usual grand Court manner at Petergof, with Grand Duke Peter arriving from Oranienbaum for the occasion, although Catherine's account suggests that neither of them went to Petergof.⁶⁰⁴ Although the official account gives little more than a list of those dignitaries at the banquet and their seating arrangements, Messelière's account gives slightly more detail, noting the coloured lights used to decorate the gardens, the fountains, the palace and along the shore. He also provides a figure of 3000 people who were guests at these celebrations.⁶⁰⁵ Although there is no indication of the source of this figure was, and it seems likely that it was an estimate, it at least gives some indication that this was a major Court event. The nineteenth-century editor of Messelière's notes points out that the *Kamer-fur'erskie zhurnaly* entry for the evening listed only fifty-eight guests at the banquet following the main celebrations.⁶⁰⁶ However, as discussed above in relation to masquerades, these banquets were usually only for a smaller and more select number of guests, usually drawn from the top ranks of the *Generalitet*, and consequently a much smaller figure is hardly surprising.

The details of Prince Karl's first visit to St Petersburg demonstrate that he was

600. *KFZh*, 1758, pp. 60-66 (21 April), 90-99 (29 June) and 82-85 (21 June).

601. *KFZh*, 1758, pp. 66-68 (25 April) and 80 (12 June).

602. See *KFZh*, 1758, pp. 70-73 (7, 8, 12, 15, 17 and 19 May).

603. 'Zapiski g. de la Messel'era', p. 1004.

604. *KFZh*, 1758, p. 100 (2 July 1758); Catherine II, *Zapiski*, p. 416.

605. 'Zapiski g. de la Messel'era', p. 1008.

606. *KFZh*, 1758, p. 106 (2 July).

held in some regard by the Empress, although not by her prospective heir. As a result, he took part in the regular features of the Court's social calendar, such as attending the weekly *kurtagi* and performances at the Opera house. He was also invited to be present at the Court's major celebrations, such as the namedays of the Imperial family and the anniversary of Elizabeth's coronation, where his preferential seating placement at the banquets for such occasions also reflected his favoured status. However, what the accounts of this initial sojourn lack is any indication of the prince's activities away from the immediate focus of the Empress's Court. In this respect, it is important that the second visit of Prince Karl to St Petersburg in 1759, on this occasion in his capacity as the new Duke of Courland, was recorded in a special journal, appended to the *Kamer-fur'erskii zhurnal* for that year by *kamer-fur'er* Amosov.⁶⁰⁷ Given that the focus of the journal is solely on Karl himself, rather than on the members of the Imperial family, as with the other official Court journals, it provides not only a different perspective on official Court events, but also a more general idea of the social activities of a member of the elite in St Petersburg.

Several details of Karl's stay remained the same as on the previous occasion. For example, he was again housed in Ivan Shuvalov's house and he was assigned Court personnel to take care of his everyday needs. Perhaps in recognition of his newly-elevated position, as Duke of Courland, his liaison with the Court was now handled by two courtiers, *kamerger* Prince Petr I. Repnin and *kamer-iunker* Prince Petr N. Trubetskoi.⁶⁰⁸ Unlike the previous visit, the journal notes the everyday routine of the prince and it is clear from the beginning that one of the most regular features was the very large number of visits. In the main, this involved other members of the elite visiting Prince Karl at his residence, initially to congratulate him on his arrival in St Petersburg. For example, on the day following his arrival, he was visited by Chancellor Count Mikhail Vorontsov, Hetman Count Kirill Razumovskii, *Gofmarshal* Baron Sivers, the French and Habsburg ambassadors, and the Danish envoy.⁶⁰⁹ Visits also took place at his instigation, with written invitations sent out through members of his retinue, Major-General Lashinal' and Colonel Ettinger.⁶¹⁰ He also paid reciprocal visits to a

607. *KFZh*, 1759, p. 223 (see footnote to sub-title).

608. *KFZh*, 1759, pp. 223-24 (17 April).

609. *KFZh*, 1759, pp. 225-26 (18 April).

610. *KFZh*, 1759, p. 227-28 (18 April) and p. 234 (22 April).

number of these people at their houses and these visits usually incorporated a meal, either in the afternoon or the evening. Given his position as Duke of Courland and antagonism toward Prussia, it is hardly surprising that the most frequent guests at the prince's residence were Baron Sivers and the French ambassador, the Marquis de l'Hospital. The exact details of the visit are not known, although it appears to have been less formalised than the Court equivalent, in other words, the audience. Nevertheless, it appears that there was an etiquette and procedure associated with it, and it formed an important part of elite life.

The other regular features of his social life were typical of the nobility of the period. Aside from attending Court events, such as the balls and banquets associated with the occasions discussed in relation to his first visit, the prince regularly attended the theatre. Interestingly, Locatelli's theatre company is mentioned in particular during late April and May, although he also attended performances at the Opera house and in the palace theatre. With reference to Catherine's description of the prince above, another of his other regular pastimes was hunting with his *kavalery* and members of the Court, both with hounds in the meadow by his residence and on horseback with guns in the environs of St Petersburg (such as Moskovskaia iamskaia myza).⁶¹¹ The prince also played cards on a daily basis, particularly in the afternoons following lunch and in the evenings. This was also a feature of Court life and, during his stay at Peterhof in June, the prince and his *kavalery* were invited to join the Empress and various members of her Court in the evenings.⁶¹² Music also featured strongly in both the Court and the prince's personal entertainments. For example, during a visit to the house of Count Esterhazy (the Habsburg ambassador), Prince Karl joined the host and several *kavalery* in playing musical instruments to entertain the other guests.⁶¹³ Referring back to Messelière's comments about his interest in flute music, on at least one occasion, Prince Karl played the flute during a Court evening at Peterhof.⁶¹⁴

Although the large number of visits were largely due to Karl's role as duke of Courland and therefore an important part of the diplomatic process in St Petersburg, there was undoubtedly a sociable aspect to them as well. Similarly he was granted

611. See, for example, *KFZh*, 1759, p. 241 (29 April).

612. See, for example, *KFZh*, 1759, p. 269 (14 June) and p. 271 (16 June).

613. *KFZh*, 1759, p. 246 (4 May).

614. *KFZh*, 1759, p. 276 (25 June).

privileged access to Court events, although as a member of the elite he would have been expected to attend anyway. The other details of his visit, such as the visits to Locatelli's theatre, the hunting trips and the prominence of both cards and music as a corollary to social gatherings, both at Court and with guests in his residence, reflect the aspects of noble social life which have been discussed above.

Popular Entertainments

Although the focus of this chapter has been on the social spaces associated with the Court, which gradually spread to other groups in society, there were other, more established forms of entertainment which both the lower orders and the elite had in common. The most common site of public entertainments was at fairs (*gulianie*), traditionally held to celebrate religious festivals, like at Shrovetide (*Maslenitsa*), days of traditional importance, like on 1st May (to celebrate the start of Spring), and national celebrations, such as coronations and victory days. Fairs held in St Petersburg could make use of the Neva river, particularly during the winter months when it was frozen solid, and this will be discussed further in relation to specific events making use of the icy conditions. The section of river alongside the Admiralty and the Winter Palace was a popular location for such events.⁶¹⁵ They tended to appeal more to the lower levels of society due to the inexpensive nature of the entertainments, their rather unrefined and uncomplicated nature, and their traditional role in Russian festive life, for a large majority of the population who had very few other social distractions.⁶¹⁶

According to William Richardson, an English observer in the late 1760s, the Russians were naturally inclined to laziness and hedonism, and so they pursued their leisure activities with great enthusiasm - indeed he compares them to children in this respect. He briefly mentions some of their festive past-times:

They assemble in crowds, sing, drink, swing on see-saws, are drawn up and down and round about in flying chairs fixed upon wheels, some with a perpendicular, and some with a horizontal motion.⁶¹⁷

615. Malcolm A. S. Burgess, 'Fairs and Entertainers in Eighteenth-Century Russia', *Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 38 (1959), pp. 95-96.

616. Burgess, 'Fairs and Entertainers', pp. 98.

617. William Richardson, *Anecdotes of the Russian Empire in a Series of Letters Written, a Few Years Ago, from St Petersburg* (London: Frank Cass, 1968), p. 212. See Chapter Three for discussion of these establishments.

The swings which he describes were *kacheli*, a popular form of peasant entertainment during the summer months.⁶¹⁸ Despite their strong connection with peasant tradition, these *gulianie* also provided a source of additional revenue for the wide variety of foreign entertainers who began to come to Russia to perform for the Imperial Court during the eighteenth century and, in many cases, these different types of entertainment came to be enjoyed by both the Court and a wider paying public.

Drinking was certainly a popular part of any public celebration, as indeed it featured prominently in everyday life, and foreign observers were frequently keen to decry the Russian propensity for 'bacchanalia'. Richardson later in his account noted that peasants spent most of their time working or in 'kabaks', which he compares to taverns.⁶¹⁹ Another English observer, the British envoy George Macartney, described this sort of behaviour in the festivities surrounding Shrovetide (*Maslenitsa*) in 1768 and it was reinforced by the figure of Bacchus, accompanied by his satyrs, riding in a chariot through the streets, blowing a trumpet to summon people out to the fair.⁶²⁰ Refreshments, liquid and otherwise, could be bought from a variety of kiosks, stalls and wandering vendors at *gulianie*. 'The Bell' was one such area - a large, colourful tent serving drinks which was located in the midst of proceedings, usually marked out by the symbol of a flag and fir tree.⁶²¹

Elements of the rural, traditional, and generally popular entertainments made the transition to the urban setting, which is hardly surprising given the large migrant population for much of the city's early history. Sideshow booths (*balagany*) provide a good example of how rural traditions could be assimilated into the urban festive space. These were covered wooden booths, with a small stage and rough benches for their patrons set out in front of it, in which short plays (usually thirty to forty minutes in length) were performed. The repertoire usually included elements drawn from Russian folk tales (*skazki*) and broad, physical comedy, using popular and familiar characters to ensure sufficient recognition for enjoyment amongst the paying Russian audience, despite the fact that many of the early *balagany* owners were foreign. Another means of attracting Russian patrons was the use of Russian *balagury* (jesters) to draw a crowd to

618. Keller, *Prazdnichnaia kul'tura Peterburga*, p. 78.

619. Richardson, *Anecdotes of the Russian Empire*, p. 216.

620. Burgess, 'Fairs and Entertainers', pp. 96-97.

621. Burgess, 'Fairs and Entertainers', pp. 97.

a particular *balagan* by telling anecdotes and jokes, whilst at the same time praising their *balagan*.⁶²² The *balagany* demonstrated a merging of Russian rural traditions - the *skazki* and *balagury* - with a development associated with a major town like St Petersburg - the popular theatre, which was pushed forward by the influx of foreign entrepreneurs and theatrical troupes, who then had to adapt to the Russian context in order to make money.

Similarly puppet theatre was thought to be accessible to a broad audience, again due to its familiar stories and popular characters from folk tales, such as Petrushka the buffoonish hero. These elements also provided a link to an older rural entertainment tradition, much in the same manner as the *balagany*.⁶²³ It received a measure of Imperial approval in the form of Grand Duke Peter Fedorovich, who owned and operated his own puppet theatre in the mid-1740s, although it was derided by his spouse as ‘the most insipid spectacle in the world’.⁶²⁴ Other notable examples in contemporary St Petersburg included Martin Nierenbach (1743) and Johann Friedrich Schütz (1745).⁶²⁵ Fritz Anton Sarger was brought to St Petersburg in 1759 by Johann Hilferding (manager of the German Theatre in St Petersburg) from Riga with his conjuring act, which used very life-like marionettes.⁶²⁶ Automata were a more sophisticated, mechanical form of puppetry, which also appeared in Russia during this period. For example, in December 1756, in Count Petr Sheremetev’s house on Millionaia ulitsa, the French *mekhanik* Pierre du Moulin displayed a number of different curiosities, including a small, moving Dutch woman, who could sew eighteenth inches of ribbon every minute, and a mechanical canary, that could sing various songs ‘as if it was alive’. The display was open every day between 2pm and 9pm and the room in which these automata were displayed could hold up to eight visitors at a time, who were charged the considerable sum of two roubles and fifty kopecks for the privilege.⁶²⁷

Ice hills (*ledianye gory*) were a popular form of entertainment in St Petersburg during the winter months, although they were particularly associated with the

622. Keller, *Prazdnichnaia kul'tura Peterburga*, p. 72-73.

623. Catriona Kelly, *Petrushka: The Russian Carnival Puppet Theatre* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 46-58.

624. *Memoirs* (tr. Cruse and Hoogenboom), p. 37.

625. *StPb Ved.*, no. 83 (17 October 1743), p. 682 and no. 1 (3 January 1745), p. 8.

626. Burgess, ‘Fairs and Entertainers’, pp. 101-2.

627. *StPb Ved.*, no. 101 (19 Dec. 1755), p. 8.

celebrations at Shrovetide. and they are mentioned in most accounts of the city's festive calendar. They also made a considerable impression on foreign observers. One of the earliest descriptions is by the Danish traveller Peder von Haven, who mentions them in his account of his visit to St Petersburg in the mid 1730s. They were essentially large wooden structures, with steps on one side and a long, steep slope on the other descending to the frozen river. Patrons were charged one kopeck per descent and Haven noted the ice hills attracted both men and women. As a result, three such hills were built in St Petersburg during his stay and functioned every day until the late evening during Shrovetide.⁶²⁸ In the 1760s, Richardson describes the process of constructing these ice hills (or 'glissades', as he calls them). The wooden slope was packed with snow and then covered in water. Once frozen, patrons could slide down on special wooden seats with foreigners accompanied by a Russian, who sat behind them to guide their descent. Two such structures could be built opposite one another, making it possible to slide down one slope and up the other, thereby avoiding having to climb the steps.⁶²⁹ Pavel Svin'in, writing in the early nineteenth century, noted that such ice-hills were traditionally set up on the Neva, especially the section between the Strelka and the Palace Embankment, on the Okhta river and on Krestovskii island. The frames of the hills were often decorated with coloured lanterns which, in the dark St Petersburg winters, created an impressive spectacle on the ice of the frozen rivers at night.⁶³⁰

They also provided a convenient focus for purveyors of other forms of entertainment, such as puppet shows, and various refreshment who no doubt relied on the long queues for the ice-hills to provide a 'captive' clientele.⁶³¹ Interestingly, the *lediane gory* are an example of a popular entertainment that was enjoyed by the elite as well, although this is not to suggest the two groups were concurrent on the slopes.⁶³² Catherine II recalled in her *Mémoires* visiting Count Nikolai Choglov's island retreat at the mouth of the Neva in early 1752 and making use of a 'sleigh run' constructed nearby for his personal use. She shared her sledge with Count Mikhail Vorontsov;

628. Peder von Haven, 'Puteshestvie v Rossiiu', in Bespiatykh (ed.), *Peterburg Anny Ioannovny*, p. 339.

629. Richardson, *Anecdotes of the Russian Empire*, pp. 212-13.

630. Pavel Svin'in, *Dostopamiatnosti Sanktpeterburga i ego okrestnostei* (St Petersburg: Liga Plus, 1997), pp. 76-78.

631. Albin M. Konechnyi, 'Peterburgskie narodnye gulian'ia na maslenoi i paskhal'noi nedeliakh', in *Peterburg i guberniia: istoriko-etnograficheskie issledovaniia*, ed. by Natal'ia V. Iukhneva (Leningrad: Nauka, 1989), p. 7.

632. Berk, 'Putevye zametki o Rossii', p. 121.

another sledge containing Princess Dar'ia Gagarina and Count Ivan Chernyshev was also mentioned on this occasion.⁶³³ The fact that the sledge overturned and Catherine's arm was injured highlights the risk associated with these 'ice-hills', a fact which was noted by foreign observers.⁶³⁴ The treacherous nature of the icy surface and the considerable height of the hills meant that they were prone to accidents, and the Police Chancellery were charged with ensuring that there were safety railings along the upper sections.⁶³⁵ There was also a summer equivalent, usually referred to *katal'nyia gory*, which made use of wheeled carts to provide momentum in the absence of ice. At Oranienbaum, a permanent set was incorporated into the *Pavil'on katal'noi gorki*, designed by Rastrelli for use by Grand Duke Peter and Grand Duchess Catherine - the pavilion still survives, albeit in a decrepit condition.⁶³⁶

By the middle of the eighteenth century, the Russian elite socialised in different spaces and enjoyed different entertainments from their Muscovite predecessors. With the exception of the important, but isolated developments under Aleksei Mikhailovich, theatre, opera and ballet were all new to the majority of the eighteenth-century Russian audience. In other areas, there were elements in common with folk traditions, as with musical entertainments and elements of the masquerade, but they occurred in different social spaces, which carried new concepts of appropriate behaviour (discussed in the next chapter). However, during this period, there were attempts to widen the degree of access to each of these areas, which had previously been reserved for members of the elite. For example, the invitation to the wider nobility and wealthy merchants to attend the Court theatre and 'public' masquerades. However, the element of control was still present, in the form of requirements like appropriate dress and the need to register for a ticket, and a sense of hierarchy was reflected in segregation, such as different entrances or rooms. However this extension, combined with the patronage of the Court for theatre troupes and other forms of entertainment, contributed to the emergence of social events

633. Interestingly, although the context makes clear that this was during the winter and it was a snow slide, the Russian phrase used is *katal'nyia gory* - compare Catherine II, *Zapiski*, p. 324 with *Memoirs* (tr. Cruse and Hoogenboom), p. 106.

634. Haven, 'Puteshestvie v Rossiю', p. 339 and William Coxe, *Travels into Poland, Russia, Sweden, and Denmark. Interspersed with Historical Relations and Political Inquiries* (London, T. Cadell, 1784), vol. 1, pp. 483-85.

635. Ivan P. Vysotskii, *Sankt-Peterburgskaia stolichnaia politsiia i gradonachal'stvo, 1703-1903* (St Petersburg: Pech. R. Golike & A Vil'borg, 1903), p. 41.

636. Keller, *Prazdnichnaia kul'tura Peterburga*, p. 75.

and spaces aimed at attracting a paying 'public', with money as the principal means of access (although dress and behaviour were still important). In addition, there were also some traditional entertainments which the social elite and the wider populace of St Petersburg had in common.

Chapter Five - Forming and Informing the Public: The Public Self

The discussion of the 'public' in the chapters thus far has focussed mainly on the creation and subsequent development of new social spaces, with the emphasis on the twin principles of exemplary spectacle and control in relation to 'public' activities. This analysis has been on a number of different scales, ranging from looking at the city as a whole, in particular its design as a 'regular' space and the role of the Police Chancellery in maintaining 'good order' within it, to the more specific activities of the ruler and the Court, both in using the city as a platform for 'public' celebrations and as the site for new social forums. In this chapter, the focus will shift to the role of the individual within these spaces and the various influences on their behaviour. Although the wider social impact of the Petrine reforms has been questioned by some historians, there can be little doubt that, in the aftermath of Peter I's return from the Grand Embassy in 1698, the members of the Russian urban elite experienced a considerable change of circumstances in relation to their everyday social lives. The introduction of social gatherings in the houses of prominent nobles and the other developments which this incorporated, such as new forms of interaction (most notably dancing) and the conspicuous inclusion of women for the first time in Russia, placed the Russian elite in unfamiliar territory. This social disorientation was compounded by the enforced changes to everyday clothing and personal grooming for the urban population, which altered the process of personal interaction, not only between men and women, but also between different social groups. The highly visible nature of such changes also contributed to its significance for 'public' life.

As a result of these changes, the Russian elite had to adapt to the requirements of the new social situation and this chapter will seek to examine some of the key elements in this process. Education was central to many of Peter's plans for the Russian nobility, certainly in relation to their envisaged role as a service elite. Although Peter's main educational interests were practical, stressing skills which he had a personal interest in and which were considered 'useful' for the State, there is evidence to suggest contemporaries recognised that social skills were an important part of noble education. This was later reflected in the establishment of the Cadet Corps under Anna Ivanovna which, although intended to provide a mainly military education for young noblemen, provided instruction in dancing and other skills useful in a social setting. The Cadet

Corps was also involved in other areas of 'public' life, which have been examined above, such as their theatrical performances, their participation in Court social gatherings (such as the 'public' masquerades, discussed in the previous chapter), and the literary circles formed by cadets, which discussed and translated foreign literature. The developments in Russian education during this period also saw an increase in literacy and this was reflected in a corresponding, albeit modest, growth in the reading 'public'. As noted in the Introduction, publishing was an important means by which information could reach this wider 'public' and consequently the contents and readership of one of the regular State publications of this period, the *Sanktpeterburgskie Vedomosti*, previously discussed in Chapter Three, will be examined.

An important element of noble education was to learn about the behaviour and social roles associated with the new social spaces present in St Petersburg. The type of formal behaviour associated with the Muscovite elite, particularly in relation to ceremonial Court occasions but also reflected in more commonplace social practices, such as receiving and entertaining guests, was not immediately applicable either in the new social gatherings introduced in this period or in everyday 'public' life in St Petersburg. The first Russian conduct literature, in the form of *Iunosti chestnoe zertsalo* (1717), was published to deal with this naïveté amongst the Russian elite and the exact nature of the advice provided in this and other such works will be examined below. Dancing has already been noted above as an important part of noble education and a prominent feature of Court entertainments. Its significance lay not only in the fact that it encouraged social interaction between the sexes, thereby helping to overcome the social reticence at such gatherings, but it also helped inform and control the movements of the body. When considered alongside the contemporary reforms of clothing and personal appearance, dancing provided defined roles for its participants and at the same time allowed for graceful movement in what were initially difficult circumstances. Finally, clothing will be discussed in relation to its role as a visible sign of this process of change. Western fashions and accessories were initially enforced by the state but were soon assimilated by the urban elite and were essential to participation in many of the 'public' activities of the Court, as discussed in Chapter Three and Four.

Education

One of the major differences between Muscovite Russia and its European neighbours

during the early modern period was in the field of education. Orthodox Christianity did not have a tradition of intellectual enquiry and, since the Church maintained tight control of education, Russia did not develop universities or scientific societies in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.⁶³⁷ Given this background, and perhaps as a result of his own meagre education as a child, Peter was determined that developments in Russian education were essential to altering cultural attitudes within Russia, as well as being the key to effective State service. One of the main difficulties that Peter faced in his educational reforms was the reluctance of the nobility to pursue anything more than a rudimentary education for their children. There were many reasons for this, and the fact that (at least initially) education in these Petrine institutions involved mixing with boys from different social backgrounds was anathema for some noble families.⁶³⁸ It is also not difficult to understand why the prospect of a prolonged absence from the family home was unpopular with both the boys and their parents.

Traditionally, education by the Church or in a trade had been undertaken locally and, in the case of private tutors, education could take place within the home itself. By contrast, the intensive and often technical nature of Petrine education required more time, and this separated the family for much longer, especially if it involved being sent abroad.⁶³⁹ As a result, efforts were made both to force the nobility to have their children educated and to provide a measure of education that could be accessed at both a local and a central level. For example, the ‘cypher’ schools established in 1714 were intended to provide basic numeracy for boys aged 10-15 years old in all *gubernii*, but failed due to the requirement for a degree of literacy in order to attend (which favoured the children of clergy and officials) and the reluctance of the nobility to have their children educated alongside other social groups. Consequently, although around 1400 children attended these schools in 1723, many ran away, meaning that less than one hundred pupils actually completed their studies.⁶⁴⁰

The School of Mathematics and Navigation was established in Moscow in 1701 to

637. For a brief overview of the educational situation prior to Peter's reign, see Joseph L. Black, *Citizens for the Fatherland: Education, Educators, and Pedagogical Ideals in Eighteenth-Century Russia* (Boulder, CO and New York: Columbia University Press, 1979), pp. 15-22.

638. Liubimenko and Tonkova, 'Kul'turnaia zhizn' Peterburga', p. 105.

639. Semenova, *Ocherki istorii byta*, p. 101.

640. Max J. Okenfuss, 'Technical Training in Russia under Peter the Great', *History of Education Quarterly*, vol. 13 (1973), pp. 338-39

produce competent naval specialists drawn from the children of the nobility, the clergy and other groups within urban society, such as the merchantry. It was inspired by the Royal Mathematical School at Christ's Hospital in London, which Peter heard about during his visit in 1698, and this British influence was consolidated when Henry Farquharson, a Scotsman, and two of his students were hired to teach navigation at the new school. It initially had two hundred pupils, who studied mainly technical subjects, such as navigation, mathematics, astronomy and geography.⁶⁴¹ But the Moscow School only dealt with a very specialised area and one in which Peter had a personal interest. On the other hand, its St Petersburg successor, the Naval Academy, provides a much clearer example of the development toward a rounded education for prospective members of the service elite. It was first mentioned in a letter from Peter to Lieutenant-Captain Grigorii G. Skorniakov-Pisarev in May 1714, in which he wrote about the plans for an academy in St Petersburg, which would require staff from the Moscow School. It was founded the following year, in 1715, at the same time as the publication of the *Instruktsiia Morskoi Akademii v Sankt-Peterburge*, which set out the intentions of the new institution. The aim was to build on the basic education provided by the Moscow School, with a broad range of subjects in addition to mathematics and navigation, including civil law, heraldry and other 'noble sciences' (*shliakhetnye nauki*). There was also a choice of seven foreign languages: English, French, Italian, German, Swedish, Danish and Latin.⁶⁴² Discipline was very strict, even in the institutions for the privileged children of the nobility. A retired soldier with a whip was placed in each class of the Naval Academy to punish any boy who misbehaved, regardless of his family's status.⁶⁴³

Given the range of subjects included in the *Instruktsiia*, it is interesting to note Ivan Kirilov's figures for the composition of classes at the Naval Academy in 1727. These figures demonstrate that certain subjects were only taught to noble children, namely geometry, trigonometry, astronomy and geography, as well as the aforementioned 'noble sciences'. Indeed the only classes in which children from other

641. Nicholas Hans, 'The Moscow School of Mathematics and Navigation (1701)', *Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 29 (1951), pp. 532-36. See also W. F. Ryan, 'Navigation and the Modernisation of Petrine Russia: Teachers, Textbooks, Terminology', in *Russia in the Age of the Enlightenment: Essays for Isabel de Madariaga*, ed. by Roger P. Bartlett and Janet M. Hartley (New York and London: St Martin's Press, 1990), pp. 75-105.

642. Feodosii F. Veselago, *Ocherk istorii morskago kadetskago korpusa* (St Petersburg: Tip. Morskago Kadetskago Korpusa, 1852), pp. 35-77.

643. *PSZ*, vol. V, no. 2937 (1 October 1715), p. 176.

social backgrounds outnumbered the nobility were those teaching literacy, using the psalter (10 to 1) or the breviary (25 to 2), perhaps indicating something about the basic literacy of the two groups before they joined the Academy.⁶⁴⁴ One reason for the difference between the type of subjects being taught to the two groups of pupils related to the roles envisaged for them after they had completed their studies - the nobility were to become naval officers, whilst the others would probably enter government service as land surveyors or topographers, continue their studies to train as architects, or be sent to teach in the provincial 'cypher' schools.⁶⁴⁵ However, other subjects, such as drawing or dancing, had a much more even distribution of pupils and this indicates their wider utility, which will be discussed below in relation to dancing.

On a wider educational scale, there were other plans for suitable preparation for young people before they entered government service. Fedor S. Saltykov, who had been sent to the Netherlands and England to study navigation, wrote a series of 'Propositions' (*Propozitsii*) on the subject of education for Peter's consideration in 1713, when he was still resident in England.⁶⁴⁶ Saltykov's suggestions contained several themes which would reappear in writings on education in Russia later in this period. His main proposal was to establish one or two schools in each *guberniia* for up to two thousand boys from the age of six until twenty-three. These children would be taught a wide range of subjects, encompassing elements of a traditional Classical education, such as Greek, Latin, rhetoric and philosophy, alongside more contemporary disciplines with military application, like mathematics, navigation, fortification and artillery. Given the proposed intake, it is interesting to note the inclusion of certain subjects, such as fencing, horsemanship and dancing, which were important elements in noble education.⁶⁴⁷ Significantly, Saltykov's proposal specifically included the provision of schools for girls between the ages of six and fifteen, at which the pupils would be taught literacy, languages (French and German), needlework, painting and dancing. The stated purpose of these schools was to bring Russian women into line with their European

644. Ivan K. Kirilov, *Tsvetushchee sostoianie vserossiiskogo gosudarstva*, ed. by Boris A. Rybakov, Leonid A. Gol'denberg and Sergei M. Troitskii (Moscow: Nauka, 1977), p. 51.

645. Ryan, 'Navigation', p. 79; Liubimenko and Tonkova, 'Kul'turnaia zhizn' Peterburga', p. 98.

646. Black, *Citizens for the Fatherland*, p. 30.

647. Fedor S. Saltykov, *Propozitsii Fedora Saltykova*, ed. by P. N. Tikhonov (St Petersburg: Tip. Imp. Akademii Nauk, 1890), pp. 23-24.

contemporaries.⁶⁴⁸ Despite clearly resonating with several of Peter's aims with regard to education, particularly its role in preparing young people for efficient service to the State, and even some of his methods, not least the threat of fines for parents failing to send their children to these schools, his suggestions were not taken any further by the tsar, although Peter did at least apparently read them carefully.⁶⁴⁹

Although the pupils at the central educational institutions were drawn from a number of urban social groups, including both the nobility and the merchantry, some of these institutions changed their admission policy after a time. For example, the Engineer's School in Moscow stopped taking in non-noble boys in 1717 because it was believed that such 'common' (*podlye*) children lacked the necessary ambition to take advantage of their education. The St Petersburg Engineer's School followed suit in 1724.⁶⁵⁰ But institutions targeted at certain parts of society were not unusual - for example, the Mining College in St Petersburg was originally intended to educate the sons of soldiers. Peter introduced an *ukaz* in 1717 to establish a school attached to the Admiralty to teach literacy and numeracy to the various craftsmen and sailors, with the aim being to improve their general performance.⁶⁵¹ The *Reglament ob upravlenii Admiralteistva i verfi* (1722) allowed for the education of the sons of the Admiralty's carpenters and other craftsmen in basic literacy and geometry.⁶⁵² The teachers in these schools were mainly clergy, although a survey of the teaching staff in such schools undertaken by the Holy Synod in 1722 noted government clerks, former soldiers, and even house-serfs. They were paid an allowance by the government and taught using the familiar combination of the primer, the breviary and the psalter.⁶⁵³ Feofan Prokopovich established a school for orphans and other needy children from a variety of social backgrounds in his house on the Karpovka river in St Petersburg in 1721. Although it enjoyed a good reputation, not least due to the educational experience of Prokopovich himself, who wrote his own primer for use in the school, it closed shortly after his death in 1736.⁶⁵⁴

648. Saltykov, 'Propozitsii', pp. 25-26.

649. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 195.

650. A. Prussak, 'Inzhenimye shkoly pri Petre I', *Voenno-istoricheskii zhurnal*, no. 7 (1940), pp. 125-27.

651. Okenfuss, 'Technical Training', p. 340.

652. *PSZ*, vol. VI, no. 3937 (1722).

653. Semenova, *Ocherki istorii byta*, pp. 94-95.

654. Black, *Citizens for the Fatherland*, p. 28.

Given the European aspirations of many of Peter's reforms, it is hardly surprising that he sought foreign tutelage in several key areas. The sixty-one young noblemen who were dispatched abroad during Peter's 'Great Embassy' to Western Europe in 1697 signalled the beginning of his policy of sending Russian men to countries like England, Holland, Germany and Italy to study subjects which could not be taught within Russia.⁶⁵⁵ Some of these were areas of interest to Peter himself, such as ship-building and navigation, whilst others reflected the changes which Russia was undergoing during the last decades of the seventeenth century, for example, in relation to art and architecture. Although the nobility were initially the focus of this foreign training policy, principally due to their envisaged role at the heart of the Petrine service state, they were by no means the only social group which was involved, especially during the second half of Peter's reign, when the emphasis began to shift away from purely military and naval skills. Examples include the forty clerks sent to Königsberg in March 1716 to receive training in administrative practice, sons of Moscow merchants sent to Holland in June 1716 to study commercial practice and languages, and the students sent to study art and architecture in Italy throughout this period.⁶⁵⁶

It is important to remember that the young noblemen sent abroad to study were only part of a wider engagement with Europe during Peter's reign. Another example would be the transformation of Russian diplomatic policy and practice at the start of the eighteenth century, both within Russia and abroad. Foreign ambassadors to Muscovite Russia usually only stayed for a short time and, apart from their ceremonial reception, were largely isolated from the populace, culturally, linguistically and even physically, given the restrictions on movement imposed on foreigners.⁶⁵⁷ By contrast, ambassadors and their staff enjoyed (not to say endured) a decidedly more active engagement with Peter and his Court. Foreign ministers and their retinues were present at virtually all major Court ceremonies and social events in the first quarter of the century, and their descriptions form an important account of this aspect of Russian life (which was discussed in the Introduction). Peter also took the important step of establishing permanent embassies to London, Paris, Vienna, Berlin and many other major European

655. Max J. Okenfuss, 'Russian Students in Europe in the Age of Peter the Great', in *The Eighteenth Century in Russia*, ed. by John G. Garrard (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), pp. 131-145.

656. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 306.

657. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 4.

cities.⁶⁵⁸ Whether those involved were sent to a foreign country to study or to represent Russia, the experience imparted a number of very important cultural lessons. Reading and instruction gave some knowledge of how to behave appropriately in a given social situation, but there was no satisfactory alternative to practical experience. Living in a foreign country provided many opportunities both to observe and participate in European social life, such as attending the theatre or a ball, walking around European cities or visiting someone's house.⁶⁵⁹ Another aspect of life observed by Russians in Western Europe was the very different social role played by the women of the elite. Both Petr Tolstoi and Andrei Matveev (in Venice and Paris respectively) noted in their diaries the politeness of European women and the corresponding effect that it had on the men around them.⁶⁶⁰

But this foreign education was not popular with the nobility, not merely because it was very expensive, but because the parents did not always see why their sons had to be sent abroad at all. The prospect was probably also quite frightening for the young men involved, since not only were they being asked to spend a long time apart from their families, but they were also being sent to non-Orthodox countries, of which they had no experience.⁶⁶¹ Nevertheless it was inadvisable to attempt to avoid Peter's orders, as demonstrated by his reaction to Vasilii Sheremetev's decision to allow his son to marry, thereby delaying his study abroad, despite having been ordered to do so in 1709.⁶⁶² Peter's approach did alter, perhaps in recognition of the difficulty of enforcing this policy, but probably more due to the development of Russian educational institutions. For example, when he issued the *ukaz* in 1715 which required all noble families to send children over the age of ten to study at the newly-established Naval Academy in St Petersburg, it included an assurance that these children would not be sent abroad, since they were being taught within Russia itself.⁶⁶³ Similarly, in a more general discussion

658. James Cracraft, *The Revolution of Peter the Great* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), pp. 73-74 and Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, pp. 60-61.

659. Mikhail M. Bogoslovskii, *Byt i nruy russkogo dvorianstva v pervoi polovine XVIII veka*, 2nd Edition (Petrograd: Zadruga, 1918), p. 12.

660. Petr A. Tolstoi, *The Travel Diary of Peter Tolstoi: A Muscovite in Early Modern Europe*, ed. and transl. by Max J. Okenfuss (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1987) and Andrei A. Matveev, *Russkii diplomat vo Frantsii (Zapiski Andreia Matveeva)* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1972).

661. Bogoslovskii, *Byt i nruy*, p. 11.

662. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 131.

663. PSZ, vol. V, no. 2968 (1715).

about Russian women during his visit to Moscow in 1716, Weber mentioned an abortive plan proposed around 1711 to send young women abroad 'in order to learn foreign customs and languages'. He believed that this plan failed largely due to the moral objections of their parents - they feared the malign influence of foreign conversation. One of the reasons that their resistance proved so effective was that the families of the young women were to be the main source of funding for these trips.⁶⁶⁴

Since objections were raised to sending Russians abroad, a compromise was to make use of foreigners within Russia as teachers. The practice of hiring foreign tutors was becoming more common amongst the Muscovite elite towards the end of the seventeenth century, but it became established at the start of the eighteenth century, with members of the Imperial family leading the way. For example, despite the reticence of Tsaritsa Praskov'ia Fedorovna in relation to several of her brother-in-law's reforms, notably her insistence on maintaining her traditional manner of dress, she took a different stance on education. She ensured that her three daughters, Ekaterina, Anna and Praskov'ia, were educated both in a traditional manner, using the *bukvar* and educational verses, and in the European manner. Two of the foreign tutors employed by the Imperial family were Dietrich Ostermann, a Westphalian and brother of Heinrich (better known as Andrei, later a prominent figure in Anna Ivanovna's administration), and Rambour, a Frenchman who later taught Peter's own daughters, Anna and Elizabeth. They were responsible for teaching French and dancing to the young women.⁶⁶⁵

Overall, despite resistance from within the Russian nobility to Peter's educational reforms, the younger generation soon began to show signs of their influence, particularly in the acquisition of foreign languages. For example, in 1721, the French ambassador, Jacques Campredon, noted the grace and charm of Andrei Matveev's daughter, Mar'ia (the future wife of Field-Marshal Aleksandr I. Rumiantsev), both of which were taken as evidence of a good education.⁶⁶⁶ Bergholz made similar comments on the nine-year-old Princess Cherkasskaia, adding that she could have passed as having

664. Weber, *The Present State of Russia*, vol. I, p. 149.

665. Mikhail I. Semevskii, *Tsaritsa Praskov'ia, 1664-1723: ocherki i razskazy iz russkoi istorii XVIII veka* (Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1991), p. 34.

666. 'Diplomaticheskaiia perepiska frantsuzskikh poslov i poslannikov pri russkom dvore (1719-22)', ed. by G. F. Shtendman, *SIRIO*, vol. 40 (St Petersburg, 1884), p. 390 [12 December 1721].

been educated in France.⁶⁶⁷ This was in part due to the practice of having foreign tutors, as in the case of Natal'ia B. Dolgorukaia (née Sheremeteva), who briefly mentions her German governess Madame Schtauden in her memoirs.⁶⁶⁸ Alternately, they could have been educated abroad, which was not uncommon during the Petrine period. Count Nikolai F. Golovin spoke English and French after having served on an English ship from 1708-16 and then ensured that both his sons and daughters learned foreign languages as part of their education.⁶⁶⁹

The variety of languages studied by Russians reflected the dominance of a certain language in a given area. For example, during Peter's reign, English and Dutch were the most common languages in naval circles, reflecting the technical superiority of the English and Dutch navies. On the other hand, German and, to a certain extent, Swedish were more common amongst the military, since they provided the inspiration for many of Peter's military reforms. Latin was the dominant European language for writing about science and technology, and Greek was influential in Orthodox circles which accounted for its prominence in education at the Kiev Academy and Moscow's Slavo-Greco-Latin Academy.⁶⁷⁰ The stress placed on the study and practice of foreign languages, both in formal education and in the advice literature of this period (discussed below), reflects their importance as an aid to social interaction, and this was apparent in the dominance of the French language in elite circles by the middle of the eighteenth century. Bergholz noted on several occasions the fact that both men and women of the Russian elite were conversant with French, German and Italian, although he provides few details on their actual conversational ability.⁶⁷¹

Further evidence of the changing attitude toward education amongst the nobility can be seen in the establishment of the 'Noble Cadet Corps' (*Shliakhetskii kadetskii korpus*) by Burkhard von Münnich in 1732. Drawing on the Prussian model, the Cadet Corps was more than simply a functional military training school. Although the focus

667. Bergholz, 'Dnevnik', *Neistovyi reformator*, p. 139.

668. Ol'ga E. Kosheleva, "Svoe detstvo" v drevnei rusi i v Rossii epokhi prosveshcheniia (XVI- XVIII vv.) (Moscow: URAO, 2000), pp. 85-88.

669. Bogoslovskii, *Byt i nray*, pp. 18-19. See also Bergholz, 'Dnevnik', *Neistovyi reformator*, p. 292.

670. Cracraft, *The Petrine Revolution in Russian Culture*, pp. 252-53 and Cracraft, *The Revolution of Peter the Great*, pp. 97-104.

671. For the examples of Andrei A. Matveev and Nikita Iu. Trubetskoi, see Bergholz, 'Dnevnik', *Neistovyi reformator*, p. 160 and 248.

remained on producing young men who could usefully serve the State in the military or in the civil administration, it reflected the demand for a Europeanised noble education. As a result, the cadets were instructed in both academic subjects, such as arithmetic, history and jurisprudence, and ‘noble’ skills such as horse-riding, fencing, dancing and foreign languages.⁶⁷² The similarities between its syllabus and that proposed by Saltykov in 1711 have been noted and, although there is no question of a link, nevertheless it highlights the trends within Russian education during this period. Annual enrolment was limited to 150 Russians and fifty Baltic Germans, and between 1732-62, the Corps had around 2000 students, of which 1557 graduated.⁶⁷³

In addition to the military and academic skills which were taught to the young noblemen, a number of other areas emerged which encouraged the cadets to make use of their education in a wider social setting. For example, the study of foreign languages led to cadets undertaking regular translation work, not only of technical and academic works, but also literature and history, and these endeavours later found a publishing outlet in the form of the presses opened by the Cadet Corps in the late 1750s.⁶⁷⁴ These activities also prompted the formation of literary discussion groups amongst the cadets, one of which (‘Society of Lovers of Russian Literature’) was founded by Aleksandr P. Sumarokov, later Russia’s leading playwright.⁶⁷⁵ Other pupils from this period included Mikhail M. Kheraskov, Petr I. Panin and Ivan P. Elagin, all prominent figures in Russia’s cultural and political life during the second half of the eighteenth century. Theatre was another area where the cadets could use their education to participate in a wider ‘public’ forum, not least due to the role of their teachers in helping to organise such events for the Court, discussed below in relation to the *tantsmeister* Jean-Baptiste Landé. As a result, they provided performers for a number of comedies, tragedies and ballets performed at Court throughout the 1730s and 1740s, in the latter period under the direction of Sumarokov.⁶⁷⁶

An alternative to the State educational institutions, particularly for the nobility,

672. *PSZ*, vol. VIII, no. 5881 (29 July 1731), pp. 793-94.

673. Black, *Citizens for the Fatherland*, pp. 47-48.

674. Marker, *Publishing*, pp. 77-78.

675. Marc Raeff *Origins of the Russian Intelligentsia: The Eighteenth-Century Nobility* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966), p. 139.

676. Vsevolod N. Vsevolodskii-Gerngross, *Istoriia teatral'nago obrazovaniia v Rossii. Tom I (XVII i XVIII vv.)* (St Petersburg: Izd. Direksii Imp. Teatrov, 1913), pp. 201-15.

was to send children to a *pansion*, a European-style school which offered instruction in literacy, foreign languages, dancing and 'proper behaviour' (*pristoinoe obkhozhenie*). There were four such schools in St Petersburg as early as 1711, although very little information survives about their ownership (most probably foreign) or their curriculum. What is clear is that strict control was exercised over these private institutions, with Count Grigorii P. Chernyshev appointed by Peter to be their official 'supervisor' (*nadziratel'*), and they enjoyed little support from either the State or the Church.⁶⁷⁷ This was an issue which was to be addressed during Elizabeth's reign. Adverts for foreign tutors offering similar instruction appeared in the *Sanktpeterburgskie Vedomosti* throughout the first half of the eighteenth century.⁶⁷⁸ The educational value of these tutors was very difficult to assess, especially in view of the relative naïveté of Russians when dealing with foreigners. It was entirely possible for any Frenchman to get a post as a foreign tutor, providing he could convince his potential employers of his credentials, genuine or otherwise. A degree of regulation was introduced by Elizabeth in 1757, which required all foreign tutors to pass an examination, organised by either the Academy of Sciences or Moscow University before they could be hired. Although unqualified tutors could be deported and their employers fined, there is no indication of how successful this measure was in practice.⁶⁷⁹

Two contemporary accounts help reveal some of the issues in education during the first half of the eighteenth century, and the influence of some of Peter's reforms is evident. Mikhail Danilov (1722-90) recalled his early education (around the age of seven) with his two cousins, Elisei and Boris, by a tutor, Brudasti, and his wife, who taught him how to read.⁶⁸⁰ In the mid-1730s, he attended the Moscow Artillery School, although the poor quality or serious personal problems of the teaching staff greatly diminished its educational value. Danilov mentioned the examples of Captain Grin'kov, who was a diligent teacher but suffered from a bad stutter, and Alabushov, who was both a drunk and a murderer - the School had to retrieve him from prison on at least three occasions.⁶⁸¹ Unsurprisingly, many pupils either ran away or sought to be excused

677. Liubimenko and Tonkova, 'Kul'turnaia zhizn' Peterburga', pp. 105-6.

678. See, for example, *StPb. Ved.*, no. 81, 1752, p. 7 (9 October) and no. 59, 1755, p. 7 (25 July).

679. *PSZ*, vol. XIV, no. 10724 (5 May 1757), p. 765.

680. Mikhail V. Danilov, *Zapiski M. V. Danilova, artillerii maiora, napisannyya im v 1771 godu (1722-62)* (Kazan: Molodyia Sily, 1913), pp. 27-29.

681. Danilov, *Zapiski*, pp. 36-37.

on health grounds. Danilov was transferred to the St Petersburg Artillery School in the 1740s, which enjoyed a better standard of staff, and he developed into a skilled draughtsman, to the extent that he was subsequently employed by the School's artillery laboratory to work on new designs for both artillery pieces and fireworks.⁶⁸²

Andrei T. Bolotov (1738-1833) gave an account of his childhood education in his *Memoirs*. It began at the age of six, when he went with other local children to a Ukrainian teacher and studied the Gospels. When Bolotov was eight, his father (a colonel) employed one of his German junior officers to teach him German and arithmetic, although the military mentality was all-too-apparent in his frequent recourse to the birch. His third tutor had enjoyed the benefit of a university education and he taught German, French, drawing and some basic geography.⁶⁸³ After this, Bolotov was sent to study with fifteen other young men at a private *pansion* in St Petersburg, run by Monsieur Ferre, a teacher at the Cadet Corps. The lessons were based on a translation of Aesop's Fables (in French) and articles taken from Russian papers. Interestingly the daughter of a local major joined them for their French language lessons. Bolotov seems to have encountered the usual problems that Russian eighteenth-century writers describe in relation to their school days - Ferre was more interested in turning a profit from his young charges than in their welfare and consequently fed them very badly.⁶⁸⁴ Bolotov also described a later visit to his uncle, *general-anshef* Maslov, who lived in St Petersburg, during which he observed the lessons of his young cousins with their tutor, Monsieur Lapis. Although the Frenchman was clearly educated, he chose to teach using a dictionary of the *Académie Française*, from which he would read articles on the etymology of certain French words. This proved both confusing and of little practical use to his pupils.⁶⁸⁵

Whilst Bolotov's account demonstrates some of the problems inherent in private education, even when conducted by those who were part of a prestigious state institution like the Cadet Corps, it is clear from both accounts that the process was at the mercy of the teaching staff in question. Bolotov's experience was mainly of foreign

682. Danilov, *Zapiski*, pp. 47-48.

683. Andrei T. Bolotov, *Zhizn' i prikliucheniia Andreia Bolotova: opisannye samim dlia svoikh potomkov* (Moscow: Sovremennik, 1986), vol. I, pp. 17 and 39-41.

684. Bolotov, *Zhizn' i prikliucheniia*, vol. I, pp. 86-92.

685. Bolotov, *Zhizn' i prikliucheniia*, vol. I, pp. 174-75.

tutors, whilst Danilov suffered at the hands of poor Russian teachers, but in both cases there was no means of assessing the quality of the education received. Despite these difficulties, the role of these educational developments had a number of important consequences. Firstly they encouraged the acquisition of new skills, particularly those thought appropriate for noble status, which could then be used both in everyday life and in a social setting. Secondly, a number of educational institutions, such as the Cadet Corps, became important centres in the development of elements of 'public' life, such as the theatre and translation of foreign works.

The Reading Public

One of the main areas in which the effects of the educational developments in Russia could be seen was in relation to literacy and reading. The readership for books and other publications is also an area which is often raised in relation to the concept of a 'public', both in Russia and throughout Europe, although there was undoubtedly a considerable difference between the two situations. Although both printing and literacy had increased considerably in Russia during the seventeenth century, especially amongst the urban population, a fact which is reflected in the much larger number of reading handbooks produced by the Moscow press in the latter half of the century, compared to the rest of Europe the numbers involved were miniscule.⁶⁸⁶ With regard to the eighteenth century, the trend within Soviet publishing historiography, led by Sergei Luppov, was to identify a burgeoning print market, particularly from Peter I's reign onwards.⁶⁸⁷ The available evidence suggests that, although the number of presses and the range of publications certainly increased, Russian publishing during the course of the eighteenth century was still far behind most other contemporary European states.⁶⁸⁸

Similarly, the extent of the Russian reading 'public' has been discussed. It was largely concentrated in St Petersburg and Moscow for much of the eighteenth century, which reflected the main consumers for published materials, including the nobility and other service personnel, merchants and foreigners. There were a number of exceptions, such as in the provinces after 1762, reflecting the literary interests of the nobility, and in

686. Marker, *Publishing*, pp. 19-20.

687. See, for example, Sergei P. Luppov, *Kniga v Rossii v pervoi chetverti XVIII veka* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1973).

688. Marker, *Publishing*, passim.

Siberia, where political prisoners were sent.⁶⁸⁹ This situation in Russia is frequently contrasted with Britain and Germany, in particular, yet the phenomenon was overwhelmingly urban throughout the rest of Europe, and relied on the people involved having both time and money to join the requisite bodies or buy the necessary publications, also implying the education needed to read and understand them.⁶⁹⁰ Indeed it has been suggested that even the early incarnations of Habermas's 'bourgeois' public sphere were certainly restricted in their social composition and outlook.⁶⁹¹

Recent work on the role of women as producers and consumers of literature has raised the issue of gender in relation to the reading public. Although literature certainly provided a means for women to express views, there were strong social restrictions on this kind of activity, most notably with regards to the concept of 'appropriate' female behaviour, discussed below. Similarly, as noted in relation to Maza's work above, this only applied to a small minority of women. Nikolai Novikov's *Opyt istoricheskogo slovaria o rossiiskikh pisateliakh* (1772) listed only nine Russian women writers, past and present, and many of these were associated with literary families. For example, Ekaterina Sumarokova, daughter of the famous playwright Aleksandr Sumarokov, had one of her elegies published in her father's journal *Trudoliubovaia pchela* in 1759. Novikov himself published satirical portraits by another woman writer, Mar'ia Sushkova, in his journal *Truten'*, even though satire was not considered a feminine literary form. However she tackled the frivolousness of fashion and the vacuousness prevalent amongst society women, both of which were in line with Novikov's view of satire as means to moral development. This presents a good example of a woman writer acknowledging the weaknesses of her gender but using a literary forum to present an alternative view, in conjunction with the wider moral debate in eighteenth-century Russia.⁶⁹²

Whilst satire proved problematic, there were other literary activities which were considered more acceptable. In particular, the translation of foreign literature, an activity already discussed in relation to the Cadet Corps, became a means for women to

689. Dixon, *Catherine the Great*, pp. 98-99.

690. Jacob, 'The Mental Landscape of the Public Sphere', pp. 99-100.

691. Calhoun, 'Introduction', p. 3.

692. Wendy Rosslyn, 'Mar'ya Vasil'evna Sushkova: An Enlightened Woman of the Eighteenth Century', *Oxford Slavonic Papers [NS]*, vol. 33 (2000), pp. 88-90.

become involved with literature and publishing, although this was only during the second half of the eighteenth century.⁶⁹³ A more usual role for women was an inspiration for literature. For example, Mikhail Kheraskov wrote his Anacreontic *New Odes* (1762) in a consciously intimate style and addressed it to ‘the intelligent woman’. However, the stress remained on women’s role as moral exemplars and civilisers. Similarly, Nikolai Novikov satirised feminising influence in Russian society (for example, dandyism) as an example of Western affectation and corruption, with the proper female role in society portrayed as that of wives and mothers. This is not to say that he did not recognise the existence of educated and virtuous women, but rather that he had a firm idea of what their role in society should be.⁶⁹⁴ With regard to women as readers and consumers of published materials, there is very little evidence for the first half of the eighteenth century, beyond the limited information provided by the memoirs of exceptional women, like Catherine II and Princess Dashkova. The first publication specifically aimed at a female readership, Novikov’s *Modnoe ezhemesiachnoe izdanie, ili biblioteka dlia damskogo tualeta*, did not appear until 1779.⁶⁹⁵

In order to discuss the reading ‘public’ in more specific terms, I will now look at the materials produced by the Academy of Sciences, which was the main secular publisher in Russia, and specifically within St Petersburg (as discussed in Chapter One) during this period. The Academy press not only printed academic works, such as the *Commentarii* mentioned above and translations of important scientific works, but a range of other ‘useful’ literature. However, print runs of these works, even a comparative best-seller such as *Iunosti chestnoe zertsalo*, discussed below in relation to conduct literature, was printed in comparatively small numbers (around 1200 copies in the course of three years). Sales of such materials, given the available information, appear to have been poor for all but the most popular subjects, with some publications eventually being distributed without charge.⁶⁹⁶ In the aftermath of Peter’s death, the

693. For an excellent recent analysis of this topic, see Wendy Rosslyn, *Feats of Agreeable Usefulness: Translations by Russian Women, 1763-1825* (Fichtenwalde: Verlag F. K. Göpfert, 2000).

694. Judith Vowles, ‘The “Feminisation” of Russian Literature: Women, Language and Literature in Eighteenth-Century Russia’, in *Women Writers in Russian Literature*, ed. by Toby W. Clyman and Diana Greene (Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1994), pp. 36-38.

695. Gitta Hammarberg, ‘Reading à la mode: The First Russian Women’s Journals’, in *Reflections on Russia in the Eighteenth Century*, ed. by Joachim Klein, Simon Dixon and Maarten Frannje (Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 2001), p. 220.

696. Marker, *Publishing*, pp. 35-40.

financial situation of the Academy meant that print runs fell further still, although translations and regular publications, such as calendars, continued to be produced and sold well.

One of these regular publications was Russia's first newspaper, originally called *Vedomosti* (or 'News'), which had begun life in 1702-3 as a means of spreading news about military events during the Great Northern War. It had continued largely as a source of translated foreign news and announcements regarding official engagements, before finally ceasing publication in early 1727.⁶⁹⁷ It was replaced by *Sanktpeterburgskie Vedomosti*, which was printed by the Academy of Sciences press from 2 January 1728. Initially, it was produced in both a Russian and a German edition, perhaps reflecting the intended readership amongst the military, Court and merchant population of the city. In this respect, it is interesting to note that a French edition was also produced from 1756 onwards.⁶⁹⁸ It was distributed twice per week, on Tuesdays and Fridays, which were 'post-days' (*pochtovye dni*), the usual method of receiving it being by means of subscription. The paper was usually eight pages in length (four printed sheets folded in half), and print runs were gradually increased from 300 copies in the late 1720s to 600 copies by the 1760s.⁶⁹⁹ The price of an annual subscription by the mid-century had reached two roubles fifty kopecks (if printed on 'news'-quality paper) or three roubles fifty kopecks (if printed on 'post'-quality paper).⁷⁰⁰ The content was largely consistent throughout the first half of the eighteenth century: foreign news (occasionally translated from Western publications), descriptions of the Court's activities (including celebrations), requests for services, details of goods for sale (particularly by 'public' auction), and other items of interest, such as notices for plays and announcements of a person's departure from St Petersburg (usually foreigners returning home). There were also occasional supplements (*Pribavlenie k Vedomostiam*), reproducing speeches by the empress or foreign monarchs, details on military

697. For excerpts from the issues of the *Vedomosti* between 1703 and 1719, see *Vedomosti: vremeni Petra Velikago. V pamiat' dvukhsotletiiia pervoi russkoi gazety* (Moscow: Sinodal'naia Tip., 1903-6), 2 vols.

698. 'Pechatnoe delo', *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, ed. by I. E. Andreevskii (St Petersburg: Brockhaus and Efron, 1898), vol. 46, p. 528.

699. *SK*, vol. IV, pp. 63-66 and Marker, *Publishing*, p. 48.

700. Dmitrii V. Tiulichev, 'Sotsial'nyi sostav podpischikov "Sanktpeterburgskikh vedomostei" (seredina XVIII v.)', in *Kniga v Rossii. XVI - seredina XIX veka: knigarsprostranenie, biblioteka, chitatel'* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1987), p. 62.

campaigns, or descriptions of State ceremonies.

The editorship of the *Vedomosti* was largely dominated by Academy personnel for the first half of the eighteenth century, including prominent academics like Gerhard-Friedrich Müller, professor of history (1728-1735), and Mikhail Lomonosov, professor of chemistry (1748-1762).⁷⁰¹ Consequently the tone of the newspaper was overwhelmingly official - there was certainly no scope for editorial or journalistic comment on a par with the contemporary English or French press. Nevertheless the Senate kept a close watch on the content of the *Vedomosti*. An *ukaz* issued by the Senate in March 1742 stated that the *Vedomosti* was alleged by the General-Procurator, Nikolai Trubetskoi (although he is not named) to have included unfair or inaccurate information (*mnogiia nespravedlivosti*). The example chosen to illustrate this assertion was from *Vedomosti* No. 17, published on 26 February of that year, in which it was reported that *deistvitel'nyi tainyi sovetnik* Mikhail Bestuzhev had been awarded the Order of St Andrei by the Empress, when he had not.⁷⁰² This prompted the order to have each issue submitted for approval by the Senate Office and for several issues to be sent to Moscow to the Senate themselves.⁷⁰³ It is not readily apparent why such an error should give cause for the Senate's response, although there could have been several factors at work. The official in question was related to the Chancellor Aleksandr Bestuzhev-Riumin, which may help explain why the Senate is involved in the complaint. It is also worth considering that the Academy of Sciences was broadly perceived as a 'foreign' institution and that, in the aftermath of Elizabeth's rise to power, such a factual slip could have been seized upon as a pretext to enforce more control over the Academy's output, which was still largely compiled and edited by foreigners in the early 1740s.⁷⁰⁴

This was compounded by the creation of a *Vedomosti* 'expedition' not long afterwards to oversee the production of the newspaper - this body was first mentioned in a document from 29 May 1744.⁷⁰⁵ Yet, despite these precautions, Elizabeth issued a personal *ukaz* in November 1751 forbidding the publication of articles in the newspaper dealing with members of the Imperial family without her prior approval. The specific

701. Marker, *Publishing*, p. 48.

702. *StPb Ved.*, no. 17 (26 February 1742), p. 134.

703. *PSZ*, vol. XI, no. 8529 (18 March 1742), p. 588.

704. Marker, *Publishing*, pp. 46-47.

705. *SK*, vol. IV, p. 51.

complaint was similar to that of the Senate in 1742, that articles supposedly dealt with events at Court, such as the award of ranks or, more specifically still, the recent Imperial sojourn at Krasnoe Selo in October of that year, when it was reported that the Empress went hunting with hounds. However, at no point does the *ukaz* make clear what has been inaccurately reported, unless one takes the reference to the award of ranks to be a link to the previous Senate complaint.⁷⁰⁶ It has been suggested that these *ukazy* were the result of a realisation on the part of the government that the Academy had enjoyed a considerable degree of publishing autonomy for almost fifteen years and that there was a need to redefine the relationship between the State and the publishing houses.⁷⁰⁷ The first law dealt specifically with the issue of accuracy in reporting, whilst the second was concerned with articles relating to the Empress and the Imperial family, which can be linked to traditional concerns about the appropriate representation of the ruler.

Some information about the readership of the *Vedomosti* in the mid-eighteenth century can be gleaned from the subscription lists contained in the records of the Academy of Sciences bookshop for the years 1749-51 and 1753. Such subscription lists pose a number of intrinsic problems for the researcher, not least that they only record the people who subscribed to the publications in question, as opposed to the actual readers. Consequently, if a book, journal or newspaper was read by a group of people, such as the members of a family or a social circle, or if it was resold, then the subscription statistics cannot take account of such factors.⁷⁰⁸ There is also the rather broad classification of certain Russian social groups in Tiulichev's analysis, making use of these subscription lists. Considerable emphasis was placed on the subscriber's position within State service, according to the Table of Ranks. If this information was not available or simply not relevant, their place of work, their regiment or some other information was recorded in its place. This leaves a rather amorphous group of urban inhabitants, who did not necessarily have a rank or noble status, nor did they belong to the merchantry. Instead, the anachronistic Soviet catch-all category of 'non-noble intelligentsia' is used to group these people, who included teachers, musicians, doctors, translators, low-level administrative and clerical staff, engravers and artists. It is

706. *PSZ*, vol. XI, no. 9903 (3 November 1751), pp. 534-35.

707. Marker, *Publishing*, p. 49.

708. Gary Marker, 'Russian Journals and their Readers in the Late Eighteenth Century', *Oxford Slavonic Papers [NS]*, vol. 19 (1986), pp. 89-90.

probably unsurprising that none of the subscribers either referred to themselves or were categorised as peasants of any kind.⁷⁰⁹

Nevertheless, the information that these lists provide gives a good indication of the broad outlines of the readership of the *Vedomosti*, for both the Russian and German language editions. For the period in question, which deals with the first years of Lomonosov's editorship, the figures provided by Tiulichev's research suggest that there was a roughly equal divide between the noble and non-noble subscribers, although the numbers favoured the non-noble side in the latter years. Within these two broad groups, the largest sections were in the military and 'political' ranks within the nobility, and the 'non-noble intelligentsiia' and merchantry amongst the non-noble groups. There was a steady increase in the number of merchant subscribers, so that by 1753 they dominated the non-noble subscribers. These trends were the same for both languages, although it is interesting to note that whilst the Russian edition naturally dominated in terms of sheer numbers, it was in the three main sections noted above that the German edition had most subscribers.⁷¹⁰ The interest within these groups is not difficult to explain. Firstly, the *Vedomosti* was the main source of foreign news within Russia, which was important for both the trading community and the foreigners serving in the Russian service. Secondly, the last two or so pages contained a considerable number of advertisements for goods and services. For example, if the Court required cloth for servants' livery or supplies for its palaces, it was announced in the newspaper so that prospective suppliers could tender for the contract. Two of the most common elements in this section were news about properties for sale or to let and the 'public' auction of goods seized by the Confiscations Office, discussed in the Introduction, which provide some interesting information on the financial state of some members of society.

Literacy increasingly became a means for individuals to access a wider 'public' forum, one in which the focus was very much on 'useful' information. However this meant that the reading public during this period generally consisted of passive, rather than active contributors. This was because, during this period, participation in this forum was restricted by a number of controlling elements, such as the small number of presses, which were under the control of State institutions and whose output was subject

709. Tiulichev, 'Sotsial'nyi sostav podpischikov', pp. 64-65.

710. Tiulichev, 'Sotsial'nyi sostav podpischikov', pp. 64 and 66.

to official scrutiny. This had an impact on the topics considered appropriate for wider consumption and imposed strict limits on expressions of opinion. Nevertheless the materials carried in the *Vedomosti* and the information provided by its subscriber lists about its readership give some indication of the areas of wider interest to a reading 'public'. Although these were mainly practical, as it was dominated by foreign news and commercial notices, there were also descriptions of social events, discussed above in Chapter Three, which informed the readers about the various elements of elite social life. The announcements of various forms of entertainment for a paying 'public', which were briefly looked at in Chapter Four, mirrored some of these elements and encouraged the readers to participate in this aspect of 'public' life.

Conduct Literature

The social experience of the eighteenth-century Russian elite was considerably different from that of their seventeenth-century predecessors. However, whilst the 'formal' setting of a State celebration could be dealt with by specific instructions to the various participants, as in the order of a procession or the different parts of a ceremony, the situation was quite different for the 'informal' setting. The Russian elite had no experience of this type of social interaction, since Muscovite Russia had no equivalent to the concept of a 'social gathering', let alone one which dispensed with the formal recognition of rank/title and encouraged the participation of women.

In response to the need to provide a new basis for personal comportment and social interaction, the *Iunosti chestnoe zertsalo ili pokazanie k zhteiskomu obkhozheniiu, sobrannoe ot raznykh avtorov* (*Honourable Mirror of Youth or a guide to social conduct, compiled from various authors*) was published in St Petersburg on 4 February 1717.⁷¹¹ Although the initial print run was only 100 copies, it was subsequently republished in 1719 (600 copies), 1723 (1200 copies, in Moscow), 1740 (578 copies), 1745 and 1767.⁷¹² The book was divided into a number of sections: the first part was similar to other primers of this period, with familiar elements like the Cyrillic alphabet, importantly using the old Slavonic alongside the new 'civil' typeface, sample phrases to aid pronunciation, and a list of numbers, in their Slavonic, Arabic and

711. *Iunosti chestnoe zertsalo ili pokazanie k zhteiskomu obkhozheniiu, sobrannoe ot raznykh avtorov*. (St Petersburg, 1717) [Facsimile edition (Moscow: Planet, 1990)].

712. *SK*, vol. III, Nos. 8732 and 8733.

Latin forms, to teach numeracy. The second part, which can be considered the *Iunosti chestnoe zertsalo* proper, was compiled by Gavriil Buzhinskii, James Bruce and Johann Werner Paus, a German scholar and translator employed by the Russian State.⁷¹³ The main source for this section was Erasmus of Rotterdam's *De civilitate morum puerilium* (Amsterdam, 1530), although it also drew on Matthieu Cordier's *Civilité puerile et honeste*, also called *Miroir de la jeunesse pour le former à bonnes moeurs* (Poitiers, 1539), not least for the title of the Russian translation, and contemporary German handbooks *Spiegel für die Bildung* and *Der Goldne Spiegel*.⁷¹⁴ This section was divided roughly into two halves, which were broadly along gender lines, although both dealt with appropriate conduct for young people.

The first half, which was aimed primarily at young men, consisted of sixty-three pieces of advice, followed by separate sections dealing specifically with one's behaviour when in conversation and generally in the company of strangers.⁷¹⁵ The range of topics covered in the sixty-three numbered paragraphs was considerable, and they included many areas which were already present in the *Domostroi* and the older Slavic primers, such as the need to respect one's parents, the appropriate way to deal with servants, and to have virtuous personal qualities like honesty, humility and a love of hard work.⁷¹⁶ However, the significance of this section was that it was the first official Russian publication to set these rather broad ideals in the context of social interaction. In other words, as well as setting out the qualities and skills that were considered useful for a young person, attention was paid to how they should behave in certain social situations. Naturally the advice offered on practical matters is drawn to some extent from the virtuous qualities noted above, but it is the fact that they are explicitly dealt with in relation to their social application which draws attention to them. For example, it may follow that a respectful young person should not interrupt someone or dismiss what they are saying because they disagree with it, but only if one has had to consider how to conduct polite conversation in the first place.

713. Cracraft, *Petrine Revolution in Russian Culture*, pp. 370-71.

714. The title link was made by Isabel de Madariaga, acknowledged in Lindsey Hughes, "'The Crown of Maidenly Honour and Virtue': Redefining Femininity in Peter I's Russia", in *Women and Gender in Eighteenth-Century Russia*, ed. by Wendy Rosslyn (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), p. 39.

715. Note that the references given in square brackets [thus] are to the numbered paragraphs in this first half.

716. Max J. Okenfuss, *The Discovery of Childhood in Russia: The Evidence of the Slavic Primer* (Newtonville, MA: Oriental Research Partners, 1980), p. 47.

Given the fact that this is a compilation of advice from several sources, albeit with common themes, the areas dealt with by *Iunosti chestnoe zertsalo* are significant for discerning something about its aims. It is clear from a number of the paragraphs that the advice was intended for young noblemen in preparation for their service careers and dealing with the Court. Due stress was put on the need to complete one's education [No. 18] and it is interesting to note the type of skills considered important for the young nobleman (*shliakhtich*, *ili dvorianin*). Horse-riding and fencing (in the Russian, 'sword-fighting', but the context indicates a more refined approach) were elements of the traditional noble upbringing, with one eye on military service, easily understood in Russia. Dancing (dealt with in more detail below) was a new and very important part of noble education, which informed a person's bearing and movement (supplemented by the instruction in fencing). The study of foreign languages was highlighted in several passages as a reflection not only of one's education but also one's status. For example, if one speaks in foreign languages, then the servants are unable to eavesdrop [No. 27]. It is significant, given the Petrine policy of sending young men to study abroad, that mention is made of the need to practise languages acquired 'in foreign lands' [No. 30], and that respect should be given to those who have had such experience [No. 31]. As noted above, conversational skills were also considered important, with the emphasis on expressing oneself in a considered and respectful manner [Nos. 4 and 6], judging the tone of a conversation [No. 7] and taking account of the other participants [No. 8].

Other paragraphs provided advice on the nature of the nobility itself. For example, noble status was not merely the result of one's family background, but should be borne out by one's words and actions [No. 15]. Similarly, space was devoted to the personal qualities that should be displayed by an honourable 'cavalier' (*kavaler*) [No. 16], the importance of keeping one's word [No. 43], and the proper way to deal with one's servants [Nos. 49-52]. The Court was identified as an important part of the young nobleman's life and presented a complex setting with various ceremonies, which required careful study and a particular array of skills to negotiate successfully [Nos. 19 and 37]. However, as discussed in Chapter One, the Court represented an organised social space in which the Russian elite might reasonably be expected to follow a ceremonial plan, and so *Iunosti chestnoe zertsalo* also presented more general advice on how to conduct oneself in the less familiar social gatherings, like banquets, wedding celebrations and other occasions where dancing and other interaction could take place

[Nos. 32 and 39]. The rather more practical tone of this advice, which noted that one should generally avoid drinking to excess, fighting with other guests, and the proper way to ask someone to dance, fits quite naturally with other paragraphs which deal with the governing of one's bodily emissions whilst in the presence of others [Nos. 55-59] and the two separate sections which follow the sixty-three paragraphs, which contain basic points on table manners and body posture.

The second half of *Iunosti* was intended for young women and, despite the change in social circumstances for women of the Russian elite and their newly-visible role in social gatherings enforced by Peter I (discussed in the Introduction), the focus was very much on the virtues which young noblewomen should try to embody.⁷¹⁷ It consisted of 'The Crown of Maidenly Honour and Virtue', which comprised twenty paragraphs devoted to the individual virtues, such as fear of God, cleanliness, honesty and charity, followed by two separate and more detailed essays on 'Maidenly Chastity' and 'Maidenly Modesty'.⁷¹⁸ The tone of this section had its foundation in the more traditional realm of religious authority, with numerous quotations from and references to the Bible complemented by the writings of both Orthodox and Western Church figures on the appropriate role and behaviour of women.⁷¹⁹ However, the emphasis on female virtue, although no doubt familiar to its readers by its religious roots and resonance with traditional Russian attitudes to women, meant that there was little affirmative advice to young women on their conduct in social situations. Admonitions on the importance of modesty appear to have precluded any discussion of suitable topics for female conversation, still less practical advice on appropriate posture and movement in 'polite company', merely warning against dressing or acting in a provocative manner.⁷²⁰

There are several important points about *Iunosti chestnoe zertsalo* which had an impact on its reception by the Russian elite. Firstly, it was only a partial compilation and translation of Erasmus's original text, which was supplemented by sections from other works, and done by people who were unsure both of what they were trying to

717. Catriona Kelly, *Refining Russia: Advice Literature, Polite Culture, and Gender from Catherine to Yeltsin* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 20.

718. Hughes, "The Crown of Maidenly Honour and Virtue", pp. 39-40.

719. Cracraft, *Petrine Revolution in Culture*, pp. 375-76.

720. Hughes, "The Crown of Maidenly Honour and Virtue", p. 41.

provide and who they were providing it for. This goes some way to explaining the rather varied and impractical nature of some of the advice, especially that in the ‘Crown of Maidenly Honour and Virtue’. Secondly, an important recent study has demonstrated that the language used in *Iunosti chestnoe zertsalo* did not involve the use of a large number of foreign loan-words, but instead used existing Russian terms to describe the new social forums and practices, such as the use of *beseda* to refer to a social evening.⁷²¹ Therefore, although the situations and types of behaviour were largely unfamiliar to the Russian readership, they were described in such a way as to make them as accessible as possible, with the aim of bridging any potential cultural divide. The extent to which this was successful is very difficult to assess, although the *Iunosti chestnoe zertsalo* was printed and sold in considerable numbers.⁷²² There are only a few foreign accounts from this period which discuss Russian social habits in any detail, most notably Bergholz’s diary and Campredon’s diplomatic correspondence, both of which were discussed in the section on education above. Certainly, in most cases, they commented favourably, and with some surprise, about the developments within the Russian elite, but they make no direct reference to conduct literature.

Although *Iunosti chestnoe zertsalo* addressed in some respects the lack of advice literature in Russian, it remained the sole example until the mid-1730s. Indeed, the nature of the advice which it offered the Russian elite must surely be considered one of the reasons why it was reprinted on four more occasions in the fifty years following Peter I’s death. However, with the development and consolidation of the Russian Court as an institution comparable with its European contemporaries in this period, there was an increased interest in reading such literature. As one might expect, not least in light of the advice offered by *Iunosti chestnoe zertsalo* itself, it was possible to read such books in their original languages, not to say a mark of sophistication to do so. To show how the process of transition might have occurred, it is worth looking at one of these works in detail. Baltasar Gracián y Morales’ *Oráculo manual y arte de prudencia* (1647) was translated by Sergei Volchkov in 1734 in Berlin, later a translator for the Academy of Sciences, as *Gratsian pridvornyi chelovek*, albeit from the French, rather than the Spanish original. This manuscript translation was apparently produced at the behest of

721. Cracraft, *Petrine Revolution in Culture*, pp. 377-78.

722. Marker, *Publishing*, pp. 30 and 36-37.

Anna Ivanovna's favourite and *ober-kamenger*, Ernst von Biron, according to a preface dated 14 June 1735 in a bound copy preserved in the Vorontsov family archive.⁷²³ The French translation by Amelot de la Houssaie, entitled *L'Homme de Cour* (Rotterdam, 1728), was also known in Russia in the 1730s and Elizabeth herself had a copy in her personal library.⁷²⁴

Volchkov's Russian translation was subsequently published in 1741, prompted by an Imperial order on 27 June 1740, and dedicated to the young tsar Ivan VI and his mother, the regent Anna Leopoldovna. Significantly, the print run for this edition - 1250 copies, by the Academy of Sciences Press in St Petersburg - was very high for a secular work.⁷²⁵ There are also indications that the printing may have been spread over several years, since part of this edition featured a replacement title page with a dedication to Elizabeth and a revised publication date of 1742, even though the order relating to this occurred in an *ukaz* from 23 January 1743.⁷²⁶ A second edition was produced in 1760, also by the Academy of Sciences, with an increased print run of 1433 copies, which perhaps indicates something of the perceived demand for the book.⁷²⁷ The only major changes for this edition were the smaller format used for the book and the addition of a new section at the end, entitled *Rekapitulatsiia ili Kratkoe povtorenie glav*. This provided an index to the major topics covered and the major figures quoted in the text. The book itself consisted of numbered paragraphs which gave advice on how to succeed at Court, with Gracian's comments on this advice. The type of advice was not dissimilar to that offered by the relevant sections of the *Iunosti chestnoe zertsalo*, with emphasis on the skills and characteristics of the ideal courtier, albeit with a worldly, rather than worthy tone. Given the length of the book and the varied topics that it addressed, it is not difficult to see why the *Rekapitulatsiia* was added, thereby allowing one to pick out relevant paragraphs on 'friendship' or 'manners' (*obkhozhenie*).

723. *StPb IRI RAN*, f. 36, op. 1, d. 846, l. 2. In her excellent work on Russian conduct literature, Kelly correctly notes that the translation had a pre-publication existence as a manuscript, but dates Volchkov's translation to 1735, rather than 1734. Kelly, *Refining Russia*, p. 19.

724. Nikolai A. Kopanev, 'Frantsuzskie knigi v Letnem dome imperatritsy Elizavety Petrovny', in *Kniga i biblioteki v Rossii v XIV - pervoi polovine XIX veka*, ed. by A. A. Zaitseva and Sergei P. Luppov (Leningrad: Biblioteka Akademii Nauk, 1982), p. 37.

725. Marker, *Printing*, p. 61.

726. *SK*, vol. I, no. 1613. The law, which dealt with dedications to either Ivan VI or Anna Leopoldovna, was not included in the *PSZ*.

727. *SK*, vol. I, no. 1614.

Another example from the same period was Vasilii Trediakovskii's translation of Nicolas Rémond des Cours's *La veritable politique des personnes de qualité* (Paris, 1692), which was published as *Istinnaia politika znatnykh i blagorodnykh osob* by the Academy of Sciences Press in 1737, with a print run of 1200 copies. A second edition was printed in 1745, although the number of copies is not known.⁷²⁸ This work consisted of eighty 'rules' or pieces of advice on a given subject and contained many elements in common with the works discussed above. These began with the duty of respecting one's parents and ranged from the need to serve one's ruler faithfully and honestly to appreciating the value of true friendship and using one's time usefully. In common with *Iunosti chestnoe zertsalo*, *Istinnaia politika* devoted several paragraphs to education and useful subjects for young 'well-born' people to study, as well as stressing the importance of personal appearance and bearing, especially at Court. At the end of the book, there was a series of short 'maxims', which carried a simple message such as 'Fear God' or 'Read books', which the young person could read and memorise easily. In many ways, *Istinnaia politika* could be seen as a transitional work, between the basic and somewhat confused *Iunosti chestnoe zertsalo* and the more worldly but less immediately applicable *Pridvornyi chelovek*, since it began with a young person's development before moving on to situations like the Court.

With the exception of "The Maidenly Crown of Honour and Virtue", the subject of appropriate behaviour and education for young women received very little attention in Russia throughout this period. However, there is some evidence to suggest that during the late 1730s, around the time that Trediakovskii and Volchkov were making translations of Western conduct literature principally aimed at young men, other well-known works dealing with young women were also considered. For example, Andrei Khrushchev, a contemporary of Tatishchev, educated in Holland between 1712-20, a member of Artemei Volynskii's circle in the late 1730s and consequently executed for treason in 1740, produced Russian translations of Fénelon's *L'Education des Filles* (1687) and de la Chétardie's *Instruction pour une jeune Princesse* (Amsterdam, 1697) in manuscript form in 1738, according to hand-written notes inside his manuscript copy of both works.⁷²⁹ The key difference was that these translations were never published.

728. *SK*, vol. I, nos. 2677-78.

729. Pavel I. Khoteev, 'Frantsuzskaia kniga v biblioteke Peterburgskoi Akademii nauk (1714-1742 gg.)', in *Frantsuzskaia kniga v Rossii v XVIII v. Ocherki istorii*, ed. by Sergei P. Luppov (Leningrad:

Indeed the first publication of Fénelon's work in Russian (*O vospitanii devits*) appeared in 1763 and used a translation by Ivan Tumanskii.⁷³⁰ Nevertheless, the existence of such manuscripts demonstrate that the material was at the very least being read in Russia. This was particularly important given Fénelon's central assertion that education was vital if women were to overcome whatever natural 'frailties' they possessed, even if female education was not to receive serious attention until the opening of the Smol'nyi Institute in 1764.⁷³¹

The intricacies of good conversation were not neglected in this period either. The aptly-titled *Domashnie razgovory* (*Domestic Conversations*) was published by the Academy of Sciences Press in 1749 in a tetralingual edition, with French, German, Russian and (for the academically-minded) Latin in parallel columns. Although no details are given about the text (there is no preface), recent scholarship has shown that it was based on a Franco-German original by Georgio Philippo Plats, with the Russian and Latin translations added by V. I. Lebedev and Christian Crusius for the 1749 edition.⁷³² It consisted of ninety-six conversations on a range of topics, such as inviting someone to one's house, discussing the qualities of tea or coffee, or making small-talk whilst strolling. The value of these 'model' conversations lay in important details such as respectful forms of address, compliments, appropriate ways to express opinion, and short anecdotes, all of which could be then be incorporated into the reader's conversational repertoire.⁷³³ Although there are no details on the initial print runs, the fact that this book went through eight editions in total before 1800, including three reprints in this tetralingual format and four using only the Russian and German translations, demonstrates something of its enduring utility.⁷³⁴

This is really only a brief overview of conduct literature during the first half of the eighteenth century in Russia highlights some of the practical issues raised by the new social situation following the Petrine reforms. There were other forms of literature

Nauka, 1986), p. 38. For details on Khrushchev's background and book collection, see Sergei P. Luppov, *Kniga v Rossii v poslepetrovskoe vremia: 1725-1740* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1976), pp. 227-34.

730. SK, vol. III, no. 7703.

731. Kelly, *Refining Russia*, p. 19 and 25.

732. Charles L. Drage, 'Russian Model Conversations, c. 1630-1773', in Bartlett and Hughes (ed.), *Russian Society and Culture and the Long Eighteenth Century*, pp. 161-62.

733. Drage, 'Russian Model Conversations', p. 162.

734. SK, vol. I, nos. 1969-76.

which were considered useful for a young person's education. For example, Fénelon's inspirational and moral work *Les Aventures de Télémaque*, translated by Trediakovskii in 1736, became a standard of noble upbringing and therefore was gradually assimilated by the Russian elite, despite the archaic nature of its prose, to the extent that Catherine II made reading passages from it a forfeit for anyone breaking one of her 'Hermitage' rules.⁷³⁵ Nevertheless, interest in and use of conduct literature for educational purposes had become established by the end of Anna Ivanovna's reign, as seen by the number of translations produced in this period. *Iunosti chestnoe zertsalo* was in many ways an unsatisfactory publication, especially in comparison to its Western contemporaries, but it was the first such work in Russia and the fact that it continued to be printed in the 1760s suggested that it played an important role in shaping the eighteenth-century Russian elite.

Dance

Dancing is defined in the Oxford English Dictionary as 'To leap, skip, hop, or glide with measured steps and rhythmical movements of the body, usually to the accompaniment of music, either by oneself, or with a partner or in a set'. However, in a given social context, dancing can have a much greater significance, either in terms of the associated physical aspects (for example, the clothing or the relative disposition of the participants) or other elements of social interaction which surround the dancing forum (for example, the forms of greetings, introductions and conversations considered appropriate at a ball).⁷³⁶ This aspect of dance can also be linked to Gellner's theories on the adoption of roles in a social setting and Lotman's work on the theatricality of behaviour amongst the eighteenth-century Russian elite, both of which were discussed in the Introduction. In the first half of the eighteenth century, dancing became an important part of the transformation of the Russian elite and was a persistent feature of education, as discussed above. The ability to dance was a means to participate in the new social environment, represented by events like the *assamblei* and masquerades. It also had a wider 'public' impact, both through social events, like the dance evenings discussed in Chapter Four, and also in affecting the ways that individuals moved and

735. Kelly, *Refining Russia*, p. 17.

736. Zakharine, 'Tanz- und Körperverhalten', p. 139.

interacted in everyday life, which will be discussed further below in relation to clothing.

Zakharine identifies two main strands within the general dance 'paradigm' in Russia between the seventeenth and the nineteenth centuries. Firstly, there is a sense in which dance was a presentation of an ordered space, similar to the military or ceremonial parade, with dancers forming symmetrical figures, usually according to a set pattern.⁷³⁷ Certainly, it is not difficult to view the Petrine *assamblei* as an extension of the parade ground, despite the supposedly 'free' atmosphere (discussed above), given the considerable degree of personal control that Peter wielded when he was present. Indeed, it is hardly surprising that dancing played a central part in Petrine entertainments, since the ability to move in time with music and execute manoeuvres in formation was a useful ability, especially given the wider military context.⁷³⁸ Secondly, the minuet (an integral part of both Court and other formal dancing in this period) can be viewed as a means to transform the dance space, wherein the dance patterns become like lettering on a sheet of paper (which Zakharine refers to as the 'grammatisation' of the dance space). The minuet also became an important symbol of education and social standing, which was reflected not only within the dance space, but in other areas, particularly personal comportment, shown for example in the position of the feet and hands in some portraits of this period, particularly when figures are pictured interacting with one another.⁷³⁹

Since Western dancing was consciously introduced in Russia during Peter's reign as both a type of activity at a social gathering and also as a catalyst for the new mixed-sex social interaction, this raises the question of whether such dancing brought with it the different connotations which it had in the Western Court setting. To begin with, it is very important to note that the differences between the Russian Court and courts in other European countries (briefly discussed in Chapter Three above) altered the social context in which dancing took place.⁷⁴⁰ Very clearly, the Russia of Peter I was not the

737. Zakharine, 'Tanz- und Körperverhalten', p. 142.

738. William H. McNeill, *Keeping Together in Time: Dance and Drill in Human History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995), pp. 132-34.

739. See, for example, the illustrative figures in one of the leading dance manuals of this period: Pierre Rameau, *Le maître à danser. Qui enseigne la manière de faire tous les differens pas de danse dans toute la régularité de l'art, & de conduire les bras à chaque pas* (Paris: Rollin fils, 1748), translated into English as: *The Dancing Master*, transl. by Cyril Beaumont (Brooklyn, NY: Dance Horizons, 1970).

740. Zakharine, 'Tanz- und Körperverhalten', pp. 149-50.

France of Louis XIV and consequently dancing played quite a different role in the Court setting. The French *grand bal* at Court in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries was essentially an extension of the Royal Ballet, which was intended to reflect the glory of the monarch, for example in his role as the Sun King. This took on a 'public' nature in two main areas. Firstly, the participants in and primary audience for this spectacle at the Court itself were the political elite of French society and this intended audience was then extended further by publishing a list of the dancers and a commentary on the ball in the *Mercure galant*.⁷⁴¹ Secondly, this type of representational symbolism, centred on the nature and glory of the ruler, is what Habermas refers to as 'representational publicness'.⁷⁴² In other words, the ruler was considered 'public' by virtue of his position at the heart of political and symbolic power. Whilst it is arguable that the Russian ruler occupied this position in terms of other means of representation (for example, art or Court ceremony) in both pre-Petrine and eighteenth-century Russia, my point in drawing attention to the issue of dance is to demonstrate that this structured, symbolic function of Western Court dance did not make the transition to Petrine Russia. However dancing itself, as a feature of Western Court and social life, was an important symbol of the changes underway in Russian society.

As noted above, dancing at the Russian Court was not an organic development. It faced the twin disapproval of the Church, which considered it in the same light as witchcraft until well into the eighteenth century, and of the elite, who considered it beneath their dignity.⁷⁴³ There had been some moves towards Polish and Ukrainian dancing under Aleksei Mikhailovich, principally within the closed context of the royal theatre.⁷⁴⁴ However the impact of such dancing was strictly limited since it was still largely a spectacle, rather than a participatory activity, and the segregated nature of elite Muscovite social events precluded any further development in this period. It was during the reign of Peter I, according to Stählin, that dancing emerged as a form of secular elite entertainment, reflecting Peter's experiences during the Grand Embassy (1697-98).⁷⁴⁵

741. Zakharine, 'Tanz- und Körperverhalten', p. 153.

742. This concept is discussed above in the Introduction; see also Habermas, *Structural Transformation*, p. 21.

743. Sergei N. Shubinskii, *Istoricheskie ocherki i rasskazy* (Moscow: Moskovskii rabochii, 1995), p.21.

744. Jakob von Stählin, *Muzyka i balet v Rossii XVIII veka* (St Petersburg: Soiuz Khudozhnikov, 2002), p. 256.

745. Stählin, *Muzyka i balet v Rossii*, pp. 257-58.

The social interaction and physical skill involved in courtly dancing was evidently a surprise to the members of Peter's party, shown by their puzzled reactions at a reception organised by Sophia-Charlotte, wife of the elector of Brandenburg, in June 1697.⁷⁴⁶ Nevertheless it was precisely occasions such as this which influenced Peter to create similar forums for this type of interaction upon his return to Russia the following year. Thus a ball was held at Franz Lefort's palace outside Moscow after an audience for the ambassador of Brandenburg-Prussia on 19 February 1699, at which Russian ladies took part in the dancing. This event was unusual enough to draw a comment to that effect from the secretary of the Austrian Legation, Johann-Georg Korb.⁷⁴⁷ The presence of armed guards to ensure participation and prevent the guests from leaving was an entirely characteristic Petrine response to the inevitable reticence on the part of many of the guests.

In a similar vein, Peter appears to have found considerable amusement in compelling the old and infirm to dance with the very young, much in the same way that he chose the fattest members of the Court to act as runners (*skorokhody*) for the wedding procession of Prince-Pope Petr Buturlin in September 1721.⁷⁴⁸ The dwarf wedding of Iakim Volkov on 14 November 1710 in St Petersburg provides an important encapsulation of this idea. The guests were invited to sit at tables around the walls of the banqueting hall, whilst the dwarfs ate and danced in the centre, with the tsar and his retinue laughing at their physical deformities and comic movements.⁷⁴⁹ The fact that it was held two weeks after the wedding of Peter's niece, Anna Ivanovna, to the Duke of Courland perhaps indicates another source of amusement for Peter. Similarly, if one takes the situation at a Court ball wherein Peter forces the assembled nobles and foreign dignitaries to drink to excess and dance badly, it is not difficult to see the parallels with the dwarf spectacle, again centring on Peter's personal amusement. These and other examples of 'mock' dance must surely have created confusion in the minds of Peter's inexperienced dance students about the function of the activity. Here, as elsewhere, Peter failed to draw a clear line between civilized and uncivilized behaviour, which it

746. Lindsey Hughes, *Peter the Great: A Biography* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002), pp. 42-43.

747. Korb, *Diary of an Austrian Secretary*, vol. I, pp. 263-65.

748. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 255.

749. Weber, *Present State of Russia*, vol. 1, pp. 286-89.

fell to his successors to clarify.

This attitude was still present in the decades following Peter's death - Shubinskii includes an anecdote about how Anna Ivanovna would slap anyone who was not performing to her taste at a Court ball - although it is important to note that this was probably as much to do with Anna's personality (or its perception by historians) as it was a reflection of absolute power.⁷⁵⁰ However, although the element of control cannot be wholly divorced from the Court, by virtue of the very strong presence of the ruler, dancing was one of the areas which saw a change in this regard during the first half of the eighteenth century. The symbolism of power discussed above with reference to Louis XIV may have been absent from the Court dances under Peter I, but nevertheless they were still largely dominated by his personal authority as tsar. The participants had to follow the tsar's lead - if he decided on a new dance figure, a change of tempo or style, or indeed how long they would dance for, then they had to obey or face a penalty (frequently a large measure of drink). Given the fact that Peter was not formally taught to dance, this made the process rather haphazard and the lack of a large codex of dancing literature (in French or Italian) or of formal dancing schools and instructors complicated matters further.⁷⁵¹

However, whereas the *assamblei* were one of the main sites for dancing during Peter's reign, by the early 1730s this was the preserve of the more socially-exclusive Court balls and masquerades. This change of emphasis has primarily been associated with the reign of Anna Ivanovna. Much has been made of the character of Anna's reign, especially the fact that she liked to be surrounded at all times by various forms of entertainment, be it jesters, singers or storytellers.⁷⁵² This can be linked to her very early widowhood (her husband, the Duke of Courland, died on the journey back from St Petersburg after their wedding in 1710) and her years of isolation at the very provincial court at Mitau, both of which are also frequently cited in relation to her emotional dependence on Ernst Biron.⁷⁵³ The emphasis on dancing at these Court balls meant that

750. Shubinskii, *Istoricheskie ocherki i rasskazy*, p. 64.

751. Zakharin, 'Tanz- und körperverhalten', pp. 153-55.

752. Aleksandr B. Kamenskii, *The Russian Empire in the Eighteenth Century: Searching for a Place in the World* (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1997), pp. 145-46.

753. Evgenii V. Anisimov, 'Anna Ivanovna', in *The Emperors and Empresses of Russia: Rediscovering the Romanovs*, comp. by Akhmed A. Iskenderov, transl. by Donald Raleigh (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1996), pp. 47-48.

it was an essential part of the elite's education, and Anna took steps to establish proper Western dancing in the educational institutions. For example, she put her *ober-kamerger* and favourite Ernst-Johann von Biron in charge of hiring foreign dance-masters to teach at the newly-established Cadet Corps. Early examples included Bazankur (Bassin-court?), Johann Schmidt and Karl Menck.⁷⁵⁴

However, the most significant of these early *tantsmeistery* was the Frenchman Jean-Baptiste Landé, who had been employed during the reign of Peter I to teach the ladies and gentlemen of the Court to dance. He was also responsible for teaching several members of the Imperial family, such as Tsarevna Elizaveta Petrovna and Anna Ivanovna herself on at least one occasion. He was hired as the *tantsmeister* for the Cadet Corps by Biron in August 1734, probably as a result of his experience and connections at Court, initially for three years on an annual salary of 300 rubles (later 500 rubles) and a set of rooms.⁷⁵⁵ Whatever the reasons for his appointment, the results were soon apparent. His cadets performed three different ballets (devised by Landé himself) for the Empress in March 1736, and another ballet was performed by his pupil Thomas Lebrun and other cadets in the theatre at the Summer Palace in 1737.⁷⁵⁶ On the basis of his initial success in using his pupils to produce ballets for performances at the Imperial Opera houses, Landé petitioned the Empress in September 1737 to establish a School of Dance under his supervision. His request was that the school should consist of twelve students, six boys and six girls, drawn from his existing pupils, whose food and clothing would be provided by the Court Office, and that it should be given a permanent home. The Empress's *ukaz* followed on 10 March 1738, granting Landé a salary of 1000 roubles per year from the Salt Office and providing two rooms in the upper apartments of the old Petrine Winter Palace to house the pupils, since Landé already had living quarters in the same palace.⁷⁵⁷

Significantly Landé also ran a private dance class from his rooms for his more able Cadets and other noble children. In this class, he moved away from the rather stiff,

754. M. Borisoglebskii, *Proshloe Baletnogo otdeleniia Peterburgskogo teatral'nogo uchilishcha, nyne Leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo khoregraficheskogo uchilishcha. Materialy po istorii russkogo baleta* (Leningrad: Izd. Len. gos. khoreograf. uchilishcha, 1938), vol. I, p. 13.

755. Galina N. Dobrovol'skaia, 'Landé', in *Muzykal'nyi Peterburg, XVIII vek. Kniga 2: K-P*, ed. by A. L. Porfir'eva (St Petersburg: Kompozitor, 2000), p. 124.

756. *RGADA*, f. 322, op. 1, d. 322, l. 2.

757. *RGIA*, f. 466, op. 1, d. 47, l. 18.

formal Court dances, which had been the focus of much of his work in Russia to that point, and began to introduce the intricate, but rather more playful contemporary Italian style of dance.⁷⁵⁸ Landé was not alone in pursuing these ‘outside interests’ - other teachers from the Cadet Corps, such as Luks, Velman and Pelin, also taught dancing privately in both merchant and noble houses. A number of petitions to the Empress from the foreign staff at both the Cadet Corps and other educational institutions (held in the Academy of Sciences archive) reveal that the motivation for such private ventures was almost certainly financial, since the teaching positions were quite modestly paid.⁷⁵⁹

The introduction of a system for teaching dancing in educational institutions, principally the Cadet Corps and the new dancing school under Landé, and private homes, by proper *tantsmeistery* as well as occasional foreign opportunists, had several important consequences, both for dancing in Russia and particularly dancing at Court. Firstly, dancing was firmly established as part of the canon of Court and elite entertainments, both as a symbol of education but also to reflect refinement, in marked contrast to the very varied nature of dancing under Peter. Secondly, the proliferation of dancing in certain sections of society had a corresponding effect on dancing in general throughout urban Russian society, which was reflected in the appearance of dance evenings for a number of different social groups in St Petersburg, discussed in Chapter Four. Thirdly, the nature of Court dancing moved away from the personal whim of the ruler toward a more objective form, informed (although not entirely dictated) by the ‘rules’ of proper dancing. That the ruler herself in this period had been tutored by *tantsmeistery* like Landé - Elizabeth was considered an excellent dancer by most contemporaries - and that many of the elite by the 1740s had enjoyed the benefits of a similar education helped to consolidate these rules.

Clothing and Accessories

The Russian elite was already familiar with some elements of Western dress from the mid-seventeenth century onwards. The Kremlin library contained illustrated books showing Western clothing.⁷⁶⁰ There were a number of foreign craftsmen and tailors in the Foreign Quarter in Moscow, who supplied clothing both for its own residents and

758. Borisoglebskii, *Proshloe Baletnogo otdeleniia*, vol. I, p. 13-14.

759. Borisoglebskii, *Proshloe Baletnogo otdeleniia*, vol. I, p. 16.

760. Raisa M. Kirsanova, *Russkii kostium i byt XVIII - XIX vekov* (Moscow: Slovo, 2002), p. 15.

also costumes for the Court theatre between 1672-75.⁷⁶¹ However, the expensive foreign materials purchased by members of the tsar's family throughout the seventeenth century, which were then used to make items of clothing, continued to come from Eastern sources, such as the Ottoman and Persian empires, rather than from Western Europe. Western styles also faced the prospect of official censure, since both Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich and his son Fedor Alekseevich issued *ukazy* banning Muscovites from wearing Western-style clothes and shaving their beards, in 1675 and 1680 respectively.⁷⁶² Nevertheless, some prominent nobles began to purchase and dress in Polish and German fashions. For example, Prince Vasilii Vasil'evich Golitsyn, the favourite of Peter's half-sister Sofia, wore Western clothing not only in his house, where he entertained foreign guests, but also in public.⁷⁶³ A portrait of Fedor Alekseevich's wife, Marfa M. Apraksina, from the very late seventeenth century highlights some of the developments taking place within the Muscovite elite. She is dressed in traditional manner, in long formal robes and with her head covered by a *kokoshnik*. However, in her left hand, she is holding a small dog and, in her right hand, she is holding a closed fan. Both of these were already common features in Western elite female portraits, but this is their first known appearance in a Russian portrait, which leads to questions about the familiarity of the Russian elite with such symbols of Western culture.⁷⁶⁴

Peter I grew up at Court during this period of gradual change in attitudes about Russia's relationship with the West. Although he was no doubt influenced by his experiences in the Foreign Quarter in Moscow as a young man, the process began in earnest with his return from the 'Grand Embassy' in 1698. It is generally believed that it was during his travels to Germany, the Netherlands and England that Peter realised that a reform of traditional Russian clothing and grooming was an important part of his wider aims for Russia. It is no coincidence that one of his first actions after his premature return to Moscow in 1698, to deal with the rebellious *strel'tsy*, was to shave members of the leading *boyar* families.⁷⁶⁵ This was not only a highly visible symbol of

761. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 280-81.

762. *PSZ*, vol. I, no. 607 (6 August 1675).

763. Lindsey Hughes, *Russia and the West: The Life of a Seventeenth-Century Westerniser, Prince Vasily Vasil'evich Golitsyn (1643-1714)* (Cambridge, MA: Oriental Research Partners, 1984).

764. Kirsanova, *Russkii kostium*, pp. 36-38.

765. This took place at Preobrazhenskoe on 26 August 1698: Korb, *Diary of an Austrian Secretary*, vol. I, pp. 155-56.

change, but also an assertion of power by Peter over the Muscovite elite, with the tsar himself wielding the razor on this occasion. A more concerted effort to tackle this issue came with the establishment of fines for wearing a beard in an *ukaz* in 1705.⁷⁶⁶ The reform of everyday clothing began on 4 January 1700 and was subsequently extended to include ceremonial clothing on 28 February 1702, forcing members of the elite and Russia's urban population to adopt initially 'Hungarian' and subsequently 'German' dress for both everyday and ceremonial occasions.⁷⁶⁷ Only the clergy and rural peasants were exempt from both of these reforms, and even the latter had to pay a kopeck of beard 'tax' if they wished to enter a town.⁷⁶⁸ Ivan Zheliabuzhskii describes how dummies (*chuchely*) were set up by the gates of Moscow to display the new manner of dress, thereby ensuring that ignorance or illiteracy was no excuse for disobedience.⁷⁶⁹ However, the fact that, between 1701-24, there were a total of seventeen different *ukazy* dealing with the issue of clothing questions the effectiveness of Peter's enforcement of his measures.⁷⁷⁰

These clothing reforms have been thoroughly analysed by historians seeking to place them in the wider context of Peter's reforms. Clothing was an important reflection of rank, especially in Muscovite Russia and changing the way in which both the nobility and other urban social groups dressed not only altered their perceptions of themselves, but also changed the way that they viewed one another.⁷⁷¹ One need only compare the traditional, and often hereditary, ceremonial robes of the *boyar* elite, made from expensive materials and decorated with precious stones, with the much simpler, German-style clothing that Peter's laws enforced to see how much of a change this involved. However, this is not to suggest that important distinctions did not still exist between the clothing of different social groups, not least in the quality of the materials and the extent of decorative details, such as buttons, lacing and embroidery. In this regard, it is interesting to note the experience of Friedrich-Christian Weber, who was invited to a social event in St Petersburg but refused entry. The advice he received from

766. Semenova, *Ocherki istorii byta i kul'turnoi zhizni Rossii*, pp. 125-26.

767. PSZ, vol. IV, no. 1741 (1 January 1700) and no. 1898 (28 February 1702).

768. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 282.

769. Ivan A. Zheliabuzhskii, 'Dnevnye zapiski', in *Rozhdenie imperii*, ed. by A. Liberman and S. Shokarev (Moscow: Fond Sergeia Dubova, 1997), p. 325.

770. Kirsanova, *Russkii kostium*, p. 11.

771. See, for example, Daniel Roche, *The Culture of Clothing: Dress and Fashion in the Ancien Régime*, transl. by Jean Birrell (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 39.

‘a certain minister’ was that he must dress ‘all trimmed over with Gold and Silver’, with the implication being that this will distinguish him from the average man on the street.⁷⁷² The potential cost of a new European wardrobe, which was now linked to wider European fashions, and the desire of the wealthier sections of society to purchase clothing and accessories of sufficient quality to reflect their status made this an expensive process.⁷⁷³

The Petrine economic writer Ivan Pososhkov sought to minimise what was considered a needless expense for certain groups, particularly the merchantry, by proposing a new system for regulating dress within society, which reflected one’s income and seniority. This system applied to all levels of urban society, from the lowest urban peasantry (who could only wear undyed Russian cloth), through the various groups of craftsmen and merchants, to the nobility (who were entitled to wear expensive, imported materials). Anyone who dressed above or below their means was to be reported, assessed and punished accordingly.⁷⁷⁴ Although Pososhkov’s proposals were not introduced, nevertheless they reflect some of the social and economic implications of the clothing reforms. An interesting point about the clothing reforms, reflected in both Peter’s *ukazy* and the comments of contemporaries like Pososhkov, is that the concern was primarily with the members of the urban community, from the noble elite to the urban peasantry.

The new clothing also presented certain issues related to gender and morality. For men, the shaving of their long beards was an attack on several important parts of their identity. A beard was a symbol of masculinity - indeed, in the Orthodox tradition, the beardless are sometimes identified as homosexuals. The beard could also represent the man’s attainment of adulthood and, again in the Orthodox tradition, it was an important link to the image of God.⁷⁷⁵ For women, the traditional dress of the elite had been multi-layered, sometimes with up to five or six dresses being worn to achieve a certain effect. The use of expensive materials, such as furs and imported cloth like silk, reflected the

772. Weber, *The Present State of Russia*, vol. 1, p. 4.

773. Arcadius Kahan, ‘The Costs of “Westernisation” in Russia: The Gentry and the Economy in the Eighteenth Century’, *Slavic Review*, vol. 25 (1966), pp. 40-66.

774. Ivan Pososhkov, *The Book of Poverty and Wealth*, ed. and transl. by A. P. Vlasto and L. R. Lewitter (London: Athlone Press, 1987), pp. 262-64.

775. Lindsey Hughes, ‘“A Beard is an Unnecessary Burden”: Peter I’s Laws on Shaving and their Roots in Early Russia’, in Bartlett and Hughes (ed.), *Russian Society and Culture*, pp. 21-34.

wealth and status of either their husbands or their families.⁷⁷⁶ Such clothing also concealed the outline of the female figure and covered her limbs, thereby ensuring that the Orthodox ideal of modesty was upheld. On a purely practical level, the layers also provided a source of warmth against the Russian climate. By contrast, the new Western style of dress had a defined waistline, visible *décolletage* and bare forearms, and it was largely designed for use in considerably more temperate climes. Given that Petrine women were ordered to dress in a manner which they doubtless considered unseemly, which was unsuited to the climate, particularly in St Petersburg, and which caused them physical discomfort, it is not difficult to understand why it was that some elite women preferred to revert to their old style of dress in the privacy of their homes or estates.⁷⁷⁷

The source of this physical discomfort arose from the use of corsets, essentially a cloth bodice, with strips of metal or whale-bone sewn in it to shape the woman's figure. Such corsets were the product of the fashion of the sixteenth-century Spanish Court, which sought to conceal the chest - in fact, younger women had lead plates sewn into the bust of their dresses to prevent any development there.⁷⁷⁸ Although this practice did not come to Russia, there was a definite move to suppress the bust, which can be seen in the portraits of women wearing Western dress from the first half of the eighteenth century.⁷⁷⁹ This was not simply due to tight corsetry - a woman with a developed bust would find this squeezed upwards by the pressure of the corset. In this case, an additional bodice was worn under the dress, which was laced at the side to ensure that everything was kept in place and the ideal shape was maintained.⁷⁸⁰ Two main types of corsets were found in Russia: the English, which was laced down the front, and the French, laced down the back and generally tighter, allowing for a waist of only forty centimetres.⁷⁸¹ Clearly, for Russian women accustomed to the relatively loose Muscovite robes, the transition was uncomfortable to say the least, since it was difficult

776. Semenova, *Ocherki istorii byta*, p. 138.

777. Lindsey Hughes, 'From Caftans to Corsets: The Sartorial Transformation of Women in the Reign of Peter the Great', in *Gender and Sexuality in Russian Civilisation*, ed. by Peter Barta (London: Routledge, 2001), pp. 25-26.

778. Kirsanova, *Russkii kostium*, p. 71.

779. This ideal was reflected in Louis Caravaque's 1730 portrait of Anna Ivanovna and Ivan Vishniakov's 1742 portrait of Elizaveta Petrovna, since neither woman was of naturally slight build: Kirsanova, *Russkii kostium*, pp. 16-17.

780. Pisarenko, *Povsednevnaia zhizn russkogo dvora*, p. 70.

781. Kirsanova, *Russkii kostium*, p. 21-23.

to both move and breathe in such corsetry without practice.

The process of transition was complicated further still with the emergence of French-style *paniers* after 1718, although they were more commonly referred to as a *fizhma* or *fizhbein* (from the German *fischbein*). This was a round (and later oval) birch-strip or whale-bone framework worn around the waist over an underskirt, on top of which an outer shirt would sit, giving the overall dress its conical shape.⁷⁸² This had a number of consequences for the wearer's posture and movement. It was no longer possible to stand with one's hands by one's sides, meaning that they were usually bent at the elbow and held in front. Also, the sheer size of the frame (which could be varied according to the social occasion - see below) made any lateral movement difficult and previously simple manoeuvres, such as walking around a room, sitting down or passing through a doorway, became an exercise in themselves.⁷⁸³ There were two important aspects of the new European clothing for women in the wider public context. Firstly, although the new style of dress made the female figure much more visible, it also incorporated devices such as corsets which sought to keep it under control. Secondly, the sheer volume of the new clothing meant that it now occupied a space of its own, rather than simply that of the person wearing it. It has been suggested that the spatial aspect is reflected in the contemporary practice of describing clothes as being 'built' (*stroit*'), rather than 'sewn', although there is evidence to suggest that a more common distinction was between 'made' (*delat*') and 'sewn'.⁷⁸⁴ This also had important implications for the nature of interpersonal space, a topic which was discussed above in the section dealing with dancing and personal comportment. A reasonable comparison can be made between the way in which clothes shaped the body and the way in which the buildings and spaces of St Petersburg were designed to both control and embellish the city's appearance.⁷⁸⁵

As with several other aspects of the Petrine reforms, there will always be questions about the extent to which the Russians understood the 'meaning' of their new

782. *Kostium v russkoi khudozhestvennoi kul'ture 18 - pervoi poloviny 20 vv. Opyt entsiklopedii*, ed. and comp. by Raisa M. Kirsanova, T. G. Morozova and V. D. Siniukov (Moscow: Bol'shaia rossiiskaia entsiklopediia, 1995), p. 297.

783. Kirsanova, *Russkii kostium*, p. 39.

784. Grigorii Z. Kaganov, *Sankt-Peterburg: Obrazy prostranstva* (Moscow: Izd. Indrik, 1995), p. 27 and Pisarenko, *Povsednevnaia zhizn' russkogo dvora*, p. 69.

785. Kaganov, *Sankt-Peterburg: Obrazy prostranstva*, pp. 27-28.

clothing, or whether it was simply an external symbol of their compliance with the tsar's new laws. In studying the (admittedly limited) evidence from contemporary art, Kirsanova suggests that there was a necessary period of adjustment, during which Russian women had to come to terms both with their new appearance and the manner in which they conducted themselves in such clothing. The fact that there were elements in common between the traditional Muscovite and the newer European styles no doubt aided the process of transition, although there were usually important differences in application or tone. For example, the French *fontange* head-dress (named after one of Louis XIV's mistresses) could be worn in a similar manner to the traditional Russian *kokoshnik*, especially by those ladies wishing to cling to the practice of covering their heads in public. But the *kokoshnik* was intended to cover the whole head, and especially the hair, in the interests of modesty, whilst the *fontange* was merely a fashionable accessory.⁷⁸⁶ The *fontange* features in an early eighteenth-century portrait of Anastas'ia Naryshkina with her two daughters, which also highlights another aspect of this transition period - her dress, with its frills, its bright colours and over-elaborate designs, would have been considered inappropriate for a lady of her social standing by the 1720s, due to the changes in fashion.⁷⁸⁷

There were also areas where Muscovite fashion persisted. For example, makeup was used in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to ensure that a lady had the requisite pale skin and red cheeks, which were traditional signs of feminine beauty. Georg Schleissinger wrote that such makeup was amongst the first gifts that a husband would buy his new wife in late seventeenth-century Russia.⁷⁸⁸ But a delicate glow was not what the Russian ladies aspired to. Samuel Collins, Tsar Aleksei Mikhkailovich's personal physician, compared the mixture of rouge and Spanish cerise applied by Russian ladies to the consistency of the paint that the English used to protect their house pipes!⁷⁸⁹ Its heavy application drew comment from several Western observers, though not all were as blunt as Patrick Gordon when he dismissed it as 'that preposterous

786. Kirsanova, *Russkii kostium*, p. 33.

787. Kirsanova, *Russkii kostium*, p. 31.

788. Georg-Adam Schleussing, 'Polnoe opisanie Rossii, nakhodiashcheisia nyne pod vlast'iu dvukh tsarei-sopravitelei Ivana Alekseevicha i Petra Alekseevicha', transl. by Liudmila P. Lapteva, *Voprosy istorii*, no. 1 (1970), p. 115.

789. Samuel Collins, *The Present State of Russia, in a Letter to a Friend at London* (London: Dorman Newman, 1671), p. 69.

custom of painting their faces'.⁷⁹⁰ Interestingly, it was compared to the English fashion for beauty spots (or patches), which were small pieces of silk or velvet used at first to cover blemishes on the skin. They could be worn on the face, the shoulders, the chest or the arms, and could take a variety of forms, such as stars, hearts and other symbols. They became popular in Russia too, a means of attracting attention to a particular part of the wearer's body and, just as with fans, there was a 'language' to these beauty spots, whose names were linked to their location.⁷⁹¹ The popularity of their use can be seen in a mid eighteenth-century *lubok*, which set out their various forms, names and meanings.⁷⁹² They were also not an item restricted solely to the nobility - Lady Rondeau noted 'some patches' as part of a gift given to one of her servants by a suitor, shortly before they became engaged (clearly any implications carried by such a gift were ignored by the young woman in question).⁷⁹³

Yet, for all the difficulties that Petrine women faced in making the transition to the new style of dress, there are indications that there were successes, especially amongst the younger ladies. For example, in his discussion of Russian women at St Petersburg social gatherings and particularly the young Princess Cherkasskaia, Bergholz commented that they stood comparison with their French contemporaries in terms of their demeanour and bearing.⁷⁹⁴ This was a process aided by the actions of prominent members of the Court, who ensured that their children were dressed and tutored in the appropriate, European manner. The Imperial family was clearly intended to be the prime example. Even though Tsaritsa Praskov'ia Fedorovna was allowed to continue to dress in the old Muscovite manner, her three daughters (including Anna Ivanovna, later to be empress) dressed in German fashion 'in public', as noted by the Dutch artist Cornelius de Bruyn, who painted their portraits during his visit to Moscow in 1702.⁷⁹⁵ One might also look at the inventory of Natal'ia Alekseevna's possessions, drawn up after her death in 1716. Natal'ia was a good example of a 'new' Russian lady, with her

790. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 189.

791. Pyliaev, *Staroe zhit'e*, p. 73.

792. 'Reestr mushek', ill. 46, in *Lubok: russkie narodnye kartinki, XVII-XVIII vv. Al'bom*, ed. and comp. by Iurii Ovsiannikov (Moscow: Sovetskii khudozhnik, 1968).

793. Vigor, *Letters from a Lady*, p. 20.

794. Bergholz, 'Zapiski', *Neistovyi reformator*, p. 168.

795. Cornelius de Bruyn, *Travels into Muscovy, Persia, and Part of the East-Indies. Containing an Accurate Description of Whatever is Most Remarkable in those Countries* (London: A. Bettesworth, 1737), vol. I, p. 30.

considerable collection of material possessions, particularly European clothing and accessories. She owned no less than eleven corsets, four *fontanges* and seven fans, as well as a large number of mirrors. This was no doubt aided by the generosity of her brother, Peter, who was believed to have given her an annual sum of 20,000 roubles.⁷⁹⁶

A portrait of Natal'ia by Ivan Nikitin (1715) shows her dressed and styled in a European manner, reflecting what might be considered the new ideal public image of the elite Petrine woman. However, one could also note the expression which suggests that the subject of the painting is not entirely at ease with either the process or her appearance. A portrait of Peter's daughter Anna, also by Nikitin and from the same period, shows a young lady dressed in a similar manner, but clearly much more at her ease, reflected in her posture and her demeanour.⁷⁹⁷ Whilst one could argue that this may be due to other factors (such as the process of portraying the subject in a flattering manner), the fact that Anna had dressed in such a way from a very early age must have had an impact. Also the issue of female portraiture was no longer as controversial as it had been in the seventeenth century.⁷⁹⁸ Interestingly, another portrait of Natal'ia depicts her surrounded by a number of medallions containing religious images and texts to demonstrate her piety, thereby presenting a more traditional image of a devout Orthodox lady. The considerable collection of icons and religious literature amongst her belongings suggests that the private life of Russian elite women retained a strong religious character, in the face of their altered image and social role.⁷⁹⁹

Although the clothing and grooming reforms enjoyed a degree of success at Court and within the urban elite, they faced resistance in a number of other areas, some of which have been touched on above. The very fact that the *ukazy* dealing with clothing and grooming were reissued several times during Peter's reign indicates that they were not as widely adopted as the State required. More significantly, *ukazy* prohibiting old-style Russian clothes continued to be issued during the reigns of Catherine I and Elizabeth, the latter reigning forty years after the first clothing reform was issued.⁸⁰⁰

796. Lindsey Hughes, 'Between Two Worlds', p. 31.

797. Kirsanova, *Russkii kostium*, pp. 14 and 21.

798. Lindsey Hughes, 'Women and the Arts at the Russian Court from the 16th to the 18th Century', in *An Imperial Collection: Women Artists from the State Hermitage Museum*, ed. by Jordana Pomeroy (Washington DC: National Museum of Women in the Arts, 2003), pp. 19-49.

799. Hughes, 'Between Two Worlds', pp. 32-33.

800. *PSZ*, vol. VI, no. 4944 (5 July 1726) and vol. IX, no. 8707 (19 February 1743).

What this highlights is the difficulty in enforcing such changes, especially outside the major cities, but also occasionally within them when official attention was directed elsewhere. For example, there was little that the government could do when the local authorities in Siberia petitioned to keep their existing clothing, since they simply could not afford to obey the new laws.⁸⁰¹ On the other hand, an informant's assertion that noblewomen in Moscow were dressing in the traditional manner and laughing at ladies in 'German' dress was more serious, since such women were amongst the main targets of Peter's reforms and the names included in the letter (such as the wives of Petr Dolgorukii and Ivan Musin-Pushkin) were from well-established, influential families.⁸⁰² One contemporary wrote that the process of adopting the new clothing took three years for Moscow and would take a further decade for the Russian provinces, although on the evidence of the *ukazy* this seems optimistic at best.⁸⁰³

Nevertheless, by the end of Peter's reign, Western dress was firmly entrenched in urban Russian society at the very least as the standard fashion, which raises the question, why were the clothing reforms largely adopted by the urban population by the end of Peter's reign, given the undoubted resentment and discomfort that the process caused? There were several considerations. Firstly, there was a blend of financial and physical coercion, combined with an element of shame. Those who failed to comply with Peter's reforms faced the prospect of fines, in the form of the 'beard tax', at the very least, and probably a physical assault from the tsar in several cases of reluctant members of the elite.⁸⁰⁴ Boris Kurakin records how officials would stand by the gates of Moscow to collect fines from those wearing old-style clothing and that those who were unable to pay had to endure the humiliation of having their *kaftan* trimmed to an appropriate length on the spot.⁸⁰⁵ Secondly, in Russia, especially in the seventeenth century, proximity to the tsar was essential to gain influence and favour at Court. During Peter's reign, this access depended on, amongst other things, the manner of

801. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 285.

802. Grigorii V. Esipov, *Raskol'nich'i dela XVIII stolietii: izvlechennyya iz del Preobrazhenskago Prikaza i tainoi rozysknykh del kantseliarii* (St Petersburg: Izd. D. E. Kozhanchikova, 1863), vol. 2, p. 176.

803. Semenova, *Ocherki istorii byta*, p. 128.

804. Hughes, *Russian in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 281 and Korb, *Diary of an Austrian Secretary*, vol. I, pp. 159-60.

805. Boris I. Kurakin, 'Zhizn' kniazia Borisa Ivanovicha Kurakina im samim opisannaia', in *Arkhiv kniazia F. A. Kurakina*, ed. by Mikhail I. Semevskii (St Petersburg: Tip. V. I. Balasheva, 1890), vol. I, p. 257.

dress and grooming. The established nobility were often willing to undergo the humiliation of shaving and dressing in a foreign manner to ensure that their position was not taken by another noble family. The less-established nobility were provided with the opportunity to advance their position.⁸⁰⁶ This proximity to the ruler was also a key factor in participating fully as part of the ‘public’ in the social and ceremonial life of the Court, discussed in Chapters Three and Four.

In the aftermath of Peter I’s death, and specifically during the reign of Anna Ivanovna, there was a gradual ‘feminisation’ of gentlemen at Court. A portrait of a boy (possibly the young Peter II) by Louis Carravaque, painted not earlier than 1729, demonstrates how the manner of elite masculine dress had changed in the two decades following Peter’s reforms. Patterned material was used for the *kaftan* and the waistcoat, both of which were now cut to present a gentler masculine figure. The details of the outfit were also more delicate, in the use of decorative buttons and embroidery on both the *kaftan* and waistcoat, silk stockings with buckled shoes (rather than the military Hessian-style boots), and the smaller, more styled wigs.⁸⁰⁷ The Court began to dress in lighter, pastel colours (for example, rose, light blue, pale green and yellow), clothing was embellished with silk embroidery, gold and silver braid, and gentlemen made use of expensive accessories, such as snuff-boxes, gold watches and walking canes. The empress often provided the necessary money for these aesthetic touches amongst her Court gentlemen.⁸⁰⁸ These developments occurred during a period when the Russian Court was beginning to emerge as a European-style institution in its own right, in contrast to its Petrine predecessor.

The emergence of proper dance instruction in noble education and the establishment of the theatre at the heart of Court entertainments led to changes in the way in which people interacted. Some of these changes related to clothing and its accessories. For example, taking snuff became more than simply an exercise in clearing one’s nose. It was also a symbol of refinement and a means of showing off wealth at Court, especially if the snuffbox’s lid had an enamel portrait of the Empress, as became fashionable. The art historian Nikolai Tarabukin examined this ritual, which involved

806. Lotman, *Besedy o russkoi kul'ture*, p. 15.

807. Kirsanova, *Russkii kostium*, pp. 48-49

808. Borisoglebskii, *Proshloe Baletnogo otdeleniia*, p. 12.

taking the snuffbox from one's pocket and holding it in one's palm, probably amidst conversation (so that one could hold the pose for longer, by pretending to be taken up in the conversation), then opening the snuffbox and taking several pinches of snuff with considerable flourish.⁸⁰⁹ This theatrical display ensured that those in the immediate vicinity were made abundantly aware of the person's familiarity with the procedure. Its place in Court life during this period is suggested by a law from 1747 banning the practice of taking snuff either in or near the Court church during a service, although this was probably as much to do with the noise as the ostentation of the process.⁸¹⁰ The walking cane was another male accessory, which served both a practical and a theatrical purpose. Although it served as a symbol of European sophistication in the early eighteenth century, it also provided a means to occupy the hands in the new style of dress, in the absence of the security a beard afforded its wearer.⁸¹¹ It was also an aid to male posture and gesture - one hand could rest on the cane whilst the other was gesturing or resting on one's hip. Towards the middle of the eighteenth century, the gentleman's bow became more theatrical, and so the cane became essential to keeping one's balance.⁸¹²

Although the period of female rule clearly had an effect on the development of male dress and mannerisms, certainly within the elite, the influence of both German and subsequently French Court fashions could also be seen in the clothing and styling of Russian ladies. The tendency toward excessive makeup certainly faded, although the predilection for precious stones (a holdover from Muscovite fashion) continued unabated. There was also a growing sense of what was considered 'appropriate' dress for certain occasions, again a development which could only take place with the emergence of a settled and organised Court. For example, Anna Leopoldovna, later regent for the infant Ivan VI, appears not to have dressed according to the established fashion for Court ladies, which drew comment from contemporaries. Field-Marshal Burkhard Münnich commented that she was 'untidy' (*neriashliva*) by nature, which he attributed to her habit of wearing a white headscarf and no *fizhma*, whether attending

809. Nikolai M. Tarabukin, *Ocherki po istorii kostiuma* (Moscow: GITIS, 1994), p. 105.

810. Volkov, *Dvor russkikh imperatorov*, pp. 26-27 (fn. 2).

811. Kirsanova, *Russkii kostium*, p. 13.

812. Kirsanova, *Russkii kostium*, p. 79.

Church, appearing in public or playing cards with a select circle of her friends.⁸¹³ There may have been other motives for describing Anna in such terms and Münnich's account makes it clear that he considered her lazy and unsuitable for any responsibility. Nevertheless the image of a woman who made no effort to maintain an appropriate state of dress in settings where one was demanded (i.e. in church or at a social gathering) highlights the importance attached to clothing in certain settings in the minds of contemporaries.

Having discussed the implications of the changes to everyday dress for the 'public' life of both the elite and the wider population, I want to end by looking at a particular element in the Court's social life during Elizabeth's reign - the *metamorfozy*, or cross-dressing masquerades. By undermining the acceptable forms of dress, they highlight the extent of the changes in both appearance and the necessary skills needed to interact properly in the new social environment. The *metamorfozy* were first mentioned in the official Court journals during Elizabeth's stay in Moscow in 1744 and the trans-gender costume of the occasion was made clear in the entries. Although Catherine noted in her *Mémoires* that masquerades took place every Tuesday, it is not clear whether all of these events had the cross-dressing element. She is certainly careful to mention that Elizabeth only invited 'those whom she herself selected', perhaps indicating a recognition that this was not an entertainment that could be widely imposed.⁸¹⁴

These masquerades only appeared again in the calendar of Court entertainments in 1750, when the Court was in its more usual residence in St Petersburg.⁸¹⁵ Catherine again discussed them in her *Mémoires* and, in this second instance, she made more specific reference to the manner of dress expected of male participants: 'large hoop skirts' (*fizhmy*), dresses and feminine Court hairstyles (*s pricheskami... nosili na kurtagakh*).⁸¹⁶ The Court record of the event makes it clear that, although female Court dress was expected of the gentlemen in question, they were not required to be discerning in their choice of apparel:

А при том быть в платье дамам в кавалерском, а кавалерам в дамском, у

813. Burkhard-Christophor Münnich, 'Ocherk upravleniia rossiiskoi imperii', *Perevoroty i voiny*, ed. by Viktor Naumov (Moscow: Fonda Sergeia Dubova, 1997), p. 307.

814. *Memoirs* (tr. Anthony), p. 55.

815. *ZhDA*, 1750 (23 October), p. 218.

816. Catherine II, *Zapiski*, p. 309. See also *Memoirs* (tr. Cruse and Hoogenboom), p. 93.

кого какое имеется: в самарах, кафтанах или шлафорах дамских.⁸¹⁷

In both of Catherine's accounts, she describes how the Court gentlemen strongly disliked this practice, since not only were they unsure how to manoeuvre in such unaccustomed clothing, but they also felt ashamed of their 'hideous' (*bezobrazny*) appearance.

Catherine's anecdote about an accident involving her falling under Karl Sievers's *fizhma* at one such masquerade, although portrayed as a humorous episode, highlights the very real difficulty that gentlemen had in controlling their clothing, which now occupied a much larger space than they were accustomed to. The fact that this occurred when they were dancing a *polonaise*, in which the man usually takes the lead, can only have added to the confusion, especially when one considers that any dance situation relied on both genders knowing the steps of the other.⁸¹⁸ Court ladies were only slightly better off, since they plainly did not suit the cut of their masculine clothing and consequently appeared unattractive:

Most of the women resembled stunted little boys, and the eldest had fat, short legs that hardly flattered them.⁸¹⁹

Indeed, aside from Catherine herself, it seems clear that the only person who enjoyed dressing in the manner of the opposite sex was the Empress herself, who apparently had the build (specifically, the legs) to wear such an outfit convincingly. Catherine's compliments to the empress on her masculine dress introduced an element of Sapphic titillation to her description of Elizabeth's impressive appearance and grace at these masquerades, although this is probably a literary flourish as much as anything else.⁸²⁰

The 'cross-dressing' masquerades provide an interesting case-study on the impact of Western clothing on Russia for several reasons. Firstly, although it was an established part of contemporary Western masquerades, such gender reversal was very rare in Russian culture, even in relation to the licentious atmosphere at gatherings such as Peter I's 'All-Drunken Synod'.⁸²¹ This was almost certainly due to religious factors - aside from the Orthodox Church's obvious disapproval for such deviant behaviour,

817. *KFZh*, 1750 (23 October), p. 118.

818. *Memoirs* (tr. Anthony), p. 56.

819. *Memoirs* (tr. Cruse and Hoogenboom), pp. 93.

820. *Memoirs* (tr. Cruse and Hoogenboom), pp. 93-94.

821. Castle, *Masquerade and Civilization*, p. 40.

Russia's proximity to the Ottoman Empire meant that any masculine elements to feminine dress were associated with heterodoxy.⁸²² Secondly, the change of clothing meant that both men and women had to adapt very quickly to their new mode of dress, with its associated difficulties. For ladies, this was certainly uncomfortable and embarrassing, but this paled in comparison to what their male counterparts had to deal with. For men, this meant having to learn how to walk, dance and otherwise conduct themselves in their wide dresses, in short the very same lessons that ladies had been forced to learn several decades earlier.

In conclusion, each of the aforementioned areas represent an attempt to inform and therefore control an individual's self-presentation to a wider group or 'in public'. Education was central to this process, since any change in the social or cultural situation required a number of new skills, which was acknowledged by both the State and writers on education. These were included in the curriculum of new institutions, principally aimed at the nobility, such as the Naval Academy and later the Cadet Corps. The growth of literacy, as a consequence of the wider developments in education, provided the means to access information on a range of subjects and, to a lesser extent in this period, to participate in a wider 'public' forum by writing. Literacy also opened up the possibility of self-education and the improvement of self, which was the motivation behind the introduction of conduct literature, thereby reinforcing the social lessons of the new settings discussed in Chapters One and Four. These skills were particularly important in the aftermath of the clothing and grooming reforms, which had a major impact on social interaction. Clothing and appearance were not only symbols of the wider changes which took place in Russian society, but were also another important means to access a number of 'public' events and spaces within the city (discussed in Chapter Four). After the introduction of these reforms during Peter's reign, there was a process of gradual refinement as the lessons were assimilated by the elite and, eventually, other groups within society. This process was supported by the activities of the Court both as a leading example and as a patron of these various areas.

822. Kirsanova, *Russkii kostium*, p. 73.

Conclusion

What I have highlighted in the above chapters are a number of key areas in the development of a 'public' in St Petersburg during the first half of the eighteenth century. It is important to remember at this point that, as indicated in the Introduction, the term 'public' was used to refer to a variety of groups and activities during this period, ranging from the wider population to the members of the Court present on ceremonial occasions, as well as the paying audience at certain social events, like the theatre. The main focus for the thesis has been on the Russian State's efforts to influence the 'public' lives of St Petersburg's inhabitants during this period, with particular reference to the overarching themes of control and exemplary spectacle raised in the Introduction. As has been shown in the preceding chapters, these themes cut across the social divide in several instances, a factor which will be discussed below in relation to the question of accessibility and participation.

Control over the 'public' in its various guises can be seen throughout St Petersburg. Firstly, its creation as a 'new' city allowed a greater degree of influence than was possible in an existing urban setting. The planning and construction of the city incorporated contemporary ideas on regularity and the desire for 'good order' throughout society. St Petersburg's appearance and the spaces created within the city reflected this element of control, not only in relation to the architecture of its streets and buildings, but also the use of its natural geography, in the form of the Summer Gardens and the Neva river. Secondly, control was also extended to many aspects of everyday life of its inhabitants through the activities of the Police Chancellery, which sought to ensure the health, safety and 'good order' of the city's population as a whole. Thirdly, the social life of the nobility demonstrated a different type of control, through the introduction of new social spaces and the various elements which were required to participate in those spaces - European-style clothing and social skills, like dancing. These skills became an increasingly common part of education throughout this period and their message was reinforced by the introduction of conduct literature, which encouraged its reader to regulate their own behaviour. These areas were then enforced as the means for other social groups to access the 'public' social events which emerged toward the end of this period.

St Petersburg was also representative of an 'ideal', insofar as its regularity and

‘good order’ were intended to be a model for both its own inhabitants and for other towns throughout Russia. It also contained a number of institutions which reflected this theme. For example, part of the rationale behind the Academy of Sciences was that it could represent a model of civilised scientific discourse and its ‘Project’ described its wider ‘public’ role through lectures and publications. Its museum and library were also opened to a wider ‘public’. The main exemplary body within St Petersburg society was the Court, which played a central role in shaping the ceremonial and festive life of the capital. This found ‘public’ expression in the form of its large-scale celebrations, frequently making use of the city’s spaces, and which were publicised further through the use of printed descriptions. Similarly the influence of the Court can be seen in the leading role its members played in shaping tastes and fashions within St Petersburg society. This was reflected in the purchase of the goods associated with the lifestyle of the wider European elite, including clothes, wigs and other accessories, and the hiring of specialist service personnel for maintenance purposes, such as dress-makers, hair-stylists and a range of craftsmen.

In both cases, these wider themes raise the issues of access to the newly-created spaces and participation in the various new forms of social interaction. In overall terms, there is a sense in which simply being present in St Petersburg itself enabled access, albeit of a very limited nature, to major State events which took place within the new city. This access cut across the social divide - what distinguished the various groups within society was their ability to engage with what they witnessed, in particular to participate in Court celebrations, where applicable. With regard to specific spaces within the city, the close association with the Court and its influence on their development considerably restricted access, although there were exceptions during Peter I’s reign, notably in relation to the *assamblei*. However, beginning in the late 1740s, there was a conscious move to widen access to events, such as the ‘public’ masquerades, and spaces, like the Imperial Opera house and the Summer Gardens, to the wider nobility and other groups within St Petersburg society. These areas were still subject to strict control, as discussed above, but the desire for wider participation is a key part of this discussion of ‘public’ life in the city. These events and the skilled personnel hired by the Court, such as theatrical troupes and musicians, also led to the organisation of these forms of entertainment for a paying ‘public’, which attracted a yet wider group of people from a number of social backgrounds.

In the print sphere, this period saw the development of a wider 'reading public', drawn from a number of groups within St Petersburg society, who were able to access information on a range of subjects which was carried in publications like the *Sanktpeterburgskie Vedomosti*. It was also possible to participate in this space, through writing and publishing, although the opportunity to do so was still subject to tight controls. Educational institutions played an important role in this development, not only by contributing to an increase in literacy during this period, but also as a focus for literary discussion groups and as publishers in their own right. However, this 'reading public' in St Petersburg, as with Russia as a whole, was tiny in comparison to that of many other European states, even by the end of this period. This point raises the limitations of the developments discussed elsewhere in this thesis. As noted in the Introduction, most Western formulations of the 'public' envisage such literary and cultural developments arising from relatively open participation and capable of self-sufficiency, rather than being wholly reliant on the support of either the monarch or the State. In this crucial respect, Russia was at a considerable remove from most of its contemporaries.

On the other hand, the aforementioned developments are significant, not only because they indicate the desire of both the Russia State and the Imperial Court to extend their influence over a number of different groups in St Petersburg society, but also in the foundations they laid for the reign of Catherine II. Many of the social spaces and cultural activities traditionally associated with Russia in the second half of the eighteenth century had their origins, however limited and hesitant, in this earlier period. Similarly, the subsequent development of St Petersburg into a leading European capital by the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries owed a considerable debt to the planning and activities undertaken in its formative years.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Arkhiv kniazia Vorontsovykh, ed. by Petr. I. Bartenev (Moscow: Tip. A. I. Mamontova, 1870-95), 40 vols.

Bergholz, Friedrich W. von, 'Dnevnik kamer-iunkera Fridrikha-Vil'gel'ma Berkhgol'tsa, 1721-1725 (ch. 1 & 2)', in *Neistovyi reformator*, ed. by Viktor Naumov and A. Liberman (Moscow: Fond Sergeia Dubova, 2000), pp. 107-502.

Bergholz, Friedrich W. von, 'Dnevnik kamer-iunkera Fridrikha-Vil'gel'ma Berkhgol'tsa, 1721-1725 (ch. 3 & 4)', in *Iunost' derzhavy*, ed. by Viktor Naumov (Moscow: Fond Sergeia Dubova, 2000), pp. 11-324.

Berch, Karl Reinhold, 'Putevye zametki o Rossii', in *Peterburg Anny Ioannovny v inostrannykh opisaniakh*, ed. by Iurii N. Bespiatykh (St Petersburg: BLITs, 1997), pp. 111-302

Bogdanov, Andrei I., *Opisanie Sanktpeterburga, 1749-1751* (St Petersburg: Sankt-Peterburgskaia filial Arkhiva Rossiiskoi Akademii Nauk, 1997).

Bruyn, Cornelius de, *Travels into Muscovy, Persia, and Part of the East-Indies. Containing an Accurate Description of Whatever is Most Remarkable in those Countries* (London: A. Bettesworth, 1737), 2 vols.

Catherine II, *Memoirs of Catherine the Great*, transl. by Katherine Anthony (London: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927).

Catherine II, *The Memoirs of Catherine the Great*, ed. by Dominique Maroger (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1955).

Catherine II, *Zapiski imperatritsy Ekateriny vtoroi* (Moscow: Orbita, 1989).

Catherine II, *The Memoirs of Catherine the Great*, transl. by Mark Cruse and Hilde Hoogenboom (New York: Modern Library, 2005).

Collins, Samuel, *The Present State of Russia, in a Letter to a Friend at London* (London: Dorman Newton, 1671).

Coxe, William, *Travels into Poland, Russia, Sweden, and Denmark. Interspersed with Historical Relations and Political Inquiries* (London, T. Cadell, 1784), 3 vols.

Danilov, Mikhail V., *Zapiski M. V. Danilova, artillerii maiora, napisannyya im v 1771*

- godu* (1722-62) (Kazan': Molodyia Sily, 1913).
- Dashwood, Francis, 'Sir Francis Dashwood's Diary of his Visit to St Petersburg in 1733', ed. by Betty Kemp, *Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 38 (1959), pp. 194-222.
- 'Diplomaticheskaia perepiska angliiskikh poslov i poslannikov pri russkom dvore (1711-1719)', ed. by A. A. Polovtsov, *SIRIO*, vol. 61 (St Petersburg, 1888).
- 'Diplomaticheskaia perepiska frantsuzskikh poslov i poslannikov pri russkom dvore (1719-22)', ed. by G. F. Shtendman, *SIRIO*, vol. 40 (St Petersburg, 1884).
- Feofan Prokopovich, *The Spiritual Regulation of Peter the Great*, ed. and transl. by Alexander V. Muller (Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 1972)
- Hanway, Jonas, *An Historical Account of the British Trade over the Caspian Sea, with the Author's Journal of Travels from England through Russia into Persia; and back through Russia, Germany and Holland. 2nd Revised and Corrected Edition* (London: Osborne, Longman and Browne, 1754), 2 vols.
- Haven, Peder von, 'Puteshestvie v Rossiui', in *Peterburg Anny Ioannovny v inostrannykh opisaniakh*, ed. by Iurii N. Bespiatykh (St Petersburg: BLITs, 1997), pp. 303-84.
- Iunosti chestnoe zertsalo ili pokazanie k zhteiskomu obkhodzheniiu, sobrannoe ot raznykh avtorov* (St Petersburg, 1717) [Facsimile edition (Moscow: Planet, 1990)]
- Juel, Just, 'Zapiski datskogo poslannika v Rossii pri Petre Velikom', in *Lavry Poltavy*, ed. by Viktor Naumov (St Petersburg: Fond Sergeia Dubova, 2001).
- Kirilov, Ivan K., *Tsvetushchee sostoianie vserossiiskogo gosudarstva*, ed. by Boris A. Rybakov, Leonid A. Gol'denberg and Sergei M. Troitskii (Moscow: Nauka, 1977).
- Korb, Johann-Georg, *Diary of an Austrian Secretary of Legation at the Court of Czar Peter the Great*, ed. and transl. by Count MacDonnell (London: Frank Cass, 1968), 2 vols. in 1.
- Kurakin, Boris I., 'Zhizn' kniazia Borisa Ivanovicha Kurakina im samim opisannaia', in *Arkhir kniazia F. A. Kurakina*, ed. by Mikhail I. Semevskii (St Petersburg: Tip. V. I. Balasheva, 1890), vol. I.
- Lubok. Russkie narodnye kartinki, XVII-XVIII vv. Al'bom*, ed. and comp. by Iurii

- Ovsiannikov (Moscow: Sovetskii khudozhnik, 1968).
- Manstein, Christoph H. von, *Contemporary Memoirs of Russia, from the year 1727 to 1744* (London: Frank Cass, 1968).
- Matveev, Andrei A., *Russkii diplomat vo Frantsii (Zapiski Andreia Matveeva)* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1972).
- Münnich, Burkhard-Christoph von, 'Dispozitsiia i tseremoniial torzhestvennogo v''ezda imperatritsy Anny Ivanovny v S.-Peterburg 16 Genvaria 1732', comp. by M. D. Khmyrov, *Russkii arkhiv*, vol. 2 (1867), pp. 332-41.
- Münnich, Burkhard-Christoph von, 'Ocherk upravleniia rossiiskoi imperii', *Perevoroty i voiny*, ed. by Viktor Naumov (Moscow: Fonda Sergeia Dubova, 1997), pp. 275-318.
- Novago voiazhirova leksikona na frantsuskom, nemetskom, latinskom i rossiiskom iazykakh. Chast' vtoraiia*, transl. by Sergei Volchkov (St Petersburg: Tip. Imp. Akademii nauk, 1764).
- Obstoiatel'noe opisanie torzhestvennykh poriadkov blagopoluchnogo vshestviia v tsarstvuiushchii grad Moskvu i sviashchenneishei koronovaniia eia Avgusteishago imperatorskogo velichestva vsepresvetleishiia derzhavneishiia velikiia gosudaryni Elisavety Petrovny, samoderzhitsy vserossiiskoi* (St Petersburg: Tip. Imp. Akademii nauk, 1744).
- Olearius, Adam, *The Travels of Olearius in Seventeenth-Century Russia*, transl. by Samuel H. Baron (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1967).
- Opisanie koronatsii Eia Velichestva Imperatritsy i Samoderzhitsy Vserossiiskoi Anny Ioannovny torzhestvenno otpravlennoi v tsarstviushchem grade Moskve, 28 apreliia, 1730 g.* (Moscow: [Pech. pri Senate], 1730).
- Opisanie o brake mezhdru Eia Vysochestvom Annoiu Petrovnoiu, Tsesarevnoiu Vserossiikoii, i Ego Korolevskim Vysochestvom Karlom Fridrikhom, Gertsogom Golshteinogottorpskim* (St Petersburg: Senatskaia Tip., 1725).
- Opisanie poriadka derzhannogo pri pogrebenii blazhennyia vysokoslavnyiia i vernodostoineishiia pamiati vsepresvetleishago derzhavneishago Petra Velikago* (St Petersburg: Senatskaia Tip., 1725).
- O smerti Petra Velikago Imperatora Rossiiskogo. Kratkaia povest'* (St Petersburg:

Senatskaia Tip., 1726).

Palaty Sanktpeterburgskoi imperatorskoi Akademii nauk biblioteki i kunstkamery s kratkim pokazaniem vsekh nakhodiashchikhsia v nikh khudozhestvennykh i natural'nykh veshchei soochinennoe dlia okhotnikov onyia veshchi smotret' zhelaiushchikh (St Petersburg: Tip. Imp. Akademii nauk, 1741).

Pis'ma i bumagi Imperatora Petra Velikago, ed. by Afanasii F. Bychkov (St Petersburg: Gosudarstvennaia tip., 1887), vol. I.

Pososhkov, Ivan T., *The Book of Poverty and Wealth*, ed. and transl. by A. P. Vlasto and L. R. Lewitter (London: Athlone Press, 1987).

Pouncy, Carolyn, *The 'Domostroi': Rules for Russian Households in the time of Ivan the Terrible* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994).

Pridvornye zhurnaly... 1741-42, 1743-48, ed. by Ivan A Cherkasov (St Petersburg: Obshchii arkhiv Ministerstva imp. Dvora, 1883 & 1913).

Proekty ugolovnago ulozheniia 1754-1766 godov, ed. by Aleksandr A. Vostokov (St Petersburg: Tip. M. M. Stasliusevicha, 1882).

Rameau, Pierre, *Le maître a danser. Qui enseigne la maniere de faire tous les differens pas de danse dans toute la régularité de l'art, & de conduire les bras à chaque pas* (Paris: Rollin fils, 1748)

- translated as: *The Dancing Master*, transl. by Cyril Beaumont (Brooklyn, NY: Dance Horizons, 1970).

‘Rasporiazhenie imperatora Pavla ob iz’’iatii iz upotrebleniia nekotorykh slov i zamene ikh drugimi’, comp. by G. K. Repinskii, *Russkaia starina*, tom 6, no. 7 (1872), p. 98.

Reformy Petra I: sbornik dokumentov, comp. by Vladimir I. Lebedev (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe sotsial’no-ekonomicheskoe izd., 1937).

Richardson, William, *Anecdotes of the Russian Empire in a Series of Letters Written, a Few Years Ago, from St Petersburg* (London: Frank Cass, 1968).

Rossiiskii, s nemetskim i frantsuzskim perevodami, slovar’, comp. by Ivan Nordstet (St Petersburg: Tip. I. K. Shnora, 1780-82), 2 parts.

Saltykov, Fedor S., *Propozitsii Fedora Saltykova*, ed. by P. N. Tikhanov (St Petersburg: Tip. Imp. Akademii Nauk, 1890).

- Schleussing, Georg-Adam, 'Polnoe opisanie Rossii, nakhodiashcheisia nyne pod vlast'iu dvukh tsarei-sopravitelei Ivana Alekseevicha i Petra Alekseevicha', transl. by Liudmila P. Lapteva, *Voprosy istorii*, no. 1 (1970), pp. 104-24.
- Shafirov, Petr P., *Razsuzhdenie, kakie zakonnye prichiny Ego Velichestvo Petr Velikii, Imperator i Samoderzhets Vserossiiskii ... k nachatiiu voiny protiv Korolia Karola XII Shvedskago 1700 godu imel* (St Petersburg: Senatskaia tip., 1717)
- translated as: *A Discourse concerning the Just Causes of the War between Sweden and Russia: 1700-1721*, ed. by William E. Butler (Dobbs Ferry, NY: Oceana Publications, 1973).
- Stählin, Jakob von, *Original Anecdotes of Peter the Great* (New York: Arno Press, 1970).
- Stählin, Jakob von, *Muzyka i balet v Rossii XVIII veka* (St Petersburg: 'Soiuz Khudozhnikov', 2002).
- Storch, Heinrich Friedrich von, *The Picture of Petersburg* (London: Longman and Rees, 1801), 2 vols.
- Strube de Piermont, Frédéric-Henri, *Lettres russiennes* (St Petersburg: [private], 1760).
- Svin'in, Pavel, *Dostopamiatnosti Sanktpeterburga i ego okrestnostei* (St Petersburg: Liga Plius, 1997).
- Teatral'naia zhizn' Rossii v epokhu Anny Ioannovny: dokumental'naia khronika, 1730-1740*, ed. by Liudmila M. Starikova (Moscow: Radiks, 1995).
- Tolkovyi slovar' zhivago velikoruskago iazyka*, comp. by Vladimir Dal' (St Petersburg and Moscow: Izd. M. O. Vol'fa, 1882), 4 vols.
- Tolstoi, Petr, *The Travel Diary of Peter Tolstoi: A Muscovite in Early Modern Europe*, ed. and transl. by Max J. Okenfuss (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1987).
- The Muscovite Law Code (Ulozhenie) of 1649*, ed. and transl. by Richard Hellie (Irvine, CA: Charles Schlacks Jr, 1988).
- The Russian Primary Chronicle*, transl. by Samuel H. Cross and Olgerd P. Shobowitz-Wetzor (New York: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1953).
- 'Ukazy, pis'ma, bumagi i rezoliutsii imperatora Petra I', ed. by Afanasii F. Bychkov, *SIRIO*, vol. 11 (St Petersburg, 1873).

Vedomosti: vremeni Petra Velikago. V pamiat' dvukhsotletii pervoi russkoi gazety (Moscow: Sinodal'naia Tip., 1903-6), 2 vols.

Vigor, Elisabeth, *Letters from a Lady, Who Resided Some Years in Russia, to her Friend in England. With Historical Notes* (London: J. Dodsley, 1775).

Weber, Friedirch-Christian, *The Present State of Russia* (London: Frank Cass, 1968), 2 vols.

Zakonodatel'stvo Petra I, ed. by A. A. Preobrazhenskii and T. E. Novitskaia (Moscow: Iuridicheskaia literatura, 1997).

'Zapiski g. de la Messel'era o prebyvanii ego v Rossii s maia 1757 po mart 1759 goda', *Russkii arkhiv*, tom 1 (1874), pp. 952-1031.

Zheliabuzhskii, Ivan A., 'Dnevnye zapiski', in *Rozhdenie imperii*, ed. by A. Liberman and S. Shokarev (Moscow: Fond Sergeia Dubova, 1997), pp. 261-358.

Zhizn' Derzhavina, po ego sochineniiam i pis'mam i po istoricheskim dokumentam, ed. by Iakov K. Grot (Moscow and St Petersburg: Izd. Imp. Akademii nauk, 1880-83), 2 vols.

Zhurnaly dezhurnykh general-ad''iutantov: tsarstvovanie imperatritsy Elizavety Petrovny, comp. by Leonid V. Evdokimov (St Petersburg: Tip. Obshchestvennaia pol'za, 1897).

Secondary Literature

Ageeva, Ol'ga G., 'Assamblei petrovskogo vremeni v russkoi dorevoliutsionnoi istoriografii', in *Istoriograficheskie i istoricheskie problemy russkoi kultury: sbornik statei*, ed. by Lev N. Pushkarev et al. (Moscow: Akademiia Nauk SSSR, 1983), pp.

Ageeva, Olga G., 'Novye iavleniia v obshchestvennoi zhizni i bytu Peterburga pervoi chetverti XVIII v.: na primere tsarskikh svadeb', in *Russkaia kul'tura v perekhodnyi period ot srednevekov'ia k novomu vremeni: sbornik statei*, ed. by A. N. Kopylov, Olga G. Ageeva and Lev N. Pushkarev (Moscow: IRI RAN, 1992), pp. 89-103.

Ageeva, Ol'ga G., 'Peterburgskii traurnyi tseremonial Doma Romanovykh v nachale XVIII v.', in *Fenomenon Peterburga*, ed. by Iurii N. Bespiatykh (St Petersburg:

- BLITs, 2001), pp. 491-505.
- Ageeva, Ol'ga G., "*Velichaishii i slavnishii bolee vsekh gradov v svete*" - grad sviatogo Petra: Peterburg v russkom obshchestvennom. soznanii nachala XVIII veka (St Petersburg: BLITs, 1999).
- A History of Private Life, Volume III: Passions of the Renaissance*, ed. by Roger Chartier, transl. by Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1987).
- Alekseeva, M. A., 'Teatr feierverkov v Rossii XVIII veka', in *Teatral'noe prostranstvo: materialy nauchnoi konferentsii* (Moscow: Izd. GMII imeni A. S. Pushkina, 1979), pp. 291-307.
- Alexander, John T., 'Favourites, Favouritism and Female Rule in Russia, 1725-1796', in *Russia in the Age of Enlightenment: Essays for Isabel de Madariaga*, ed. by Roger Bartlett and Janet Hartley (London: MacMillan, 1990), pp. 106-24.
- Alexander, John T., 'The Courts of the Russian Empresses in the Eighteenth Century', *The Court Historian*, vol. 4, no. 2 (1999), pp. 141-50.
- Alexander, John T., 'Amazon Autocratixes: Images of Female Rule in the Eighteenth Century', in *Gender and Sexuality in Russian Civilisation*, ed. by Peter Barta (London: Routledge, 2001), pp. 33-53.
- Alexander, John T., 'Catherine I, her Court and Courtiers', in *Peter the Great and the West: New Perspectives*, ed. by Lindsey Hughes (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 227-49.
- Anderson, M. S., 'Peter the Great: Imperial Revolutionary?', in *The Courts of Europe: Politics, Patronage and Royalty, 1400-1800*, ed. by A. G. Dickens (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977), pp. 263-82.
- Anemone, Anthony, 'The Monsters of Peter the Great: The Culture of the St Petersburg Kunstkamera in the Eighteenth Century', *Slavic and East European Journal*, vol. 44 (2000), pp. 583-602.
- Anisimov, Evgenii V., *Rossiia v seredine XVIII veka: bor'ba za nasledie Petra* (Moscow: Mysl', 1986).
- Anisimov, Evgenii V., *The Reforms of Peter the Great: Progress through Coercion in Russia*, trans. John T. Alexander (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1993).
- Anisimov, Evgenii V., *The Empress Elizabeth: Her Reign and her Russia, 1741-1761*,

- trans. John T. Alexander (Gulf Breeze, FL: Academic International Press, 1995).
- Anisimov, Evgenii V., 'Anna Ivanovna', in *The Emperors and Empresses of Russia: Rediscovering the Romanovs*, comp. by Akhmed A. Iskenderov, transl. by Donald Raleigh (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1996), pp. 37-65.
- Anisimov, Evgenii V., *Gosudarstvennye preobrazovaniia i samoderzhavie Petra Velikogo v pervoi chetverti XVIII veka* (St Peterburg: Dmitrii Bulianin, 1997).
- Anisimov, Evgenii V., *Iunyi grad* (St Petersburg: Izd. Dmitriia Bulanina, 2003).
- Baehr, Stephen, *The Paradise Myth in Eighteenth-Century Russia: Utopian Patterns in Early Secular Russian Literature and Culture* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991).
- Baker, Keith Michael, *Inventing the French Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).
- Baker, Keith Michael, 'Defining the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century France: Variation on a Theme by Habermas', in *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, ed. by Craig Calhoun (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992), pp. 181-211.
- Bartlett, Roger P., 'Russia and the Enlightenment', in *Structure and Tradition in Russian Society: Papers from an International Conference on the Occasion of the Seventieth Birthday of Iurii M. Lotman*, ed. by Robert Reid, Joe Andrew and Valentina Polukhina (Helsinki: Slavica Helsingiensia, 1994), pp. 1-17.
- Bater, James, *St Petersburg: Industrialisation and Change* (London: Edward Arnold, 1976).
- Becker, Marvin B., *The Emergence of Civil Society in the Eighteenth Century: A Privileged Moment in the History of England, Scotland, and France* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1994).
- Behrisch, Lars, 'Social Discipline in Early Modern Russia, Seventeenth to Nineteenth Centuries', in *Institutionen, Instrumente und Akteure sozialer Kontrolle und Disziplinierung im frühneuzeitlichen Europa*, ed. by Heinz Schilling (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klosterman, 1999), pp. 325-57.
- Black, Joseph L., *Citizens for the Fatherland: Education, Educators, and Pedagogical Ideals in Eighteenth-Century Russia* (Boulder, CO and New York: Columbia University Press, 1979).

- Blanning, T. C. W., *The Culture of Power and the Power of Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
- Blanning, T. C. W., *The Oxford Short History of Europe: The Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
- Bogoiavlenskii, Sergei K., 'Moskovskii teatr pri tsariakh Aleksee i Petre', *ChOIDR*, vol. 249, kn. 2 (1914), pp. 1-192.
- Bogoslovskii, Mikhail M., *Byt i nruvy russkogo dvorianstva v pervoi polovine XVIII veka*, 2nd Edition (Petrograd: Zadruga, 1918).
- Bolotov, Andrei T., *Zhizn' i prikliucheniia Andreia Bolotova: opisannye samim dlia svoikh potomkov* (Moscow: Sovremennik, 1986), 4 vols.
- Boltunova, Ekaterina M., 'The Russian Imperial Court in the Eighteenth Century', unpublished paper, BASEES Annual Conference (April 2005).
- Borisoglebskii, M., *Proshloe Baletnogo otdeleniia Peterburgskogo teatral'nogo uchilishcha, nyne Leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo khoregraficheskogo uchilishcha: materialy po istorii russkogo baleta* (Leningrad: Izd. Len. gos. khoreograf. uchilishcha, 1938), 2 vols.
- Bozherianov, Ivan N., *Peterburgskaia starina: 24 ocherki i razskazy* (St Petersburg: Izd. knizhnago sklada N. I. Ignatova, 1909).
- Bradley, Joseph, 'Subjects into Citizens: Societies, Civil Society, and Autocracy in Tsarist Russia', *American Historical Review*, vol. 107, no. 4 (2002), pp. 1094-1123.
- Buganov, V. I., 'Ekaterina I', *Voprosy istorii*, no. 11 (1994), pp. 39-49.
- Bunin, Mikhail S., *Mosty Leningrada: ocherki istorii i arkhitektury mostov Peterburga - Petrograda - Leningrada* (Leningrad: Stroizdat, 1986).
- Burgess, Malcolm A. S., 'Fairs and Entertainers in Eighteenth-Century Russia', *Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 38 (1959), pp. 95-113.
- Bushkovitch, Paul, 'The Epiphany Ceremony of the Russian Court in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', *Russian Review*, vol. 49, no. 1 (1990), pp. 1-18.
- Castle, Terry, *Masquerade and Civilisation: The Carnivalesque in Eighteenth-Century English Culture and Fiction* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1986).
- Chartier, Roger, *The Cultural Origins of the French Revolution* (Durham, NC: Duke

- University Press, 1991).
- Chudinova, Irina, 'The Audio-Spatial Aspect of St Petersburg in the Eighteenth Century', *Kul'turologiia - Petersburg Journal of Cultural Studies*, vol. 2 (1994), pp. 40-72.
- Clark, Peter, *Sociability and Urbanity: Clubs and Societies in the Eighteenth-Century City* (Leicester: University of Leicester, 1986).
- Cracraft, James, *The Church Reform of Peter the Great* (London: Macmillan, 1971).
- Cracraft, James, 'Opposition to Peter the Great', in *Imperial Russia, 1700-1917: State, Society, Opposition*, ed. by Ezra Mendelsohn and Marshall Schatz (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1988), pp. 22-34.
- Cracraft, James, *The Petrine Revolution in Russian Architecture* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1988).
- Cracraft, James, *The Revolution of Peter the Great* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003).
- Cracraft, James, *The Petrine Revolution in Russian Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004).
- Cross, Anthony G., 'The Russian Literary Scene in the Reign of Paul I', *Canadian-American Slavic Studies*, vol. 7, no. 1 (1973), pp. 39-51.
- Cross, Anthony G., 'The Russian Banya in the Descriptions of Foreign Travellers and in the Depictions of Foreign and Russian Artists', *Oxford Slavonic Papers [NS]*, vol. 24 (1991), pp. 34-59.
- Crummey, Robert O., 'Court Spectacles in Seventeenth-Century Russia: Illusion and Reality', in *Essays in honour of A. A. Zimin*, ed. by Daniel Clarke Waugh (Columbus, OH: Slavica, 1985), pp. 130-58.
- Dixon, Simon, *Catherine the Great* (London and New York: Longman, 2001).
- Dixon, Simon, 'Religious Ceremony at the Eighteenth-Century Russian Court' (forthcoming).
- Dodgshon, Robert, *Society in Time and Space: A Geographical Perspective on Change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- Dolgova, S. R., "'... ekhat' i perepisat' imianno bez medleniia": Pervye zhiteli Peterburga. 1717 g.', *Istoricheskii arkhiv*, no. 2 (2003), pp. 7-20.

- Drage, Charles L., 'Russian Model Conversations, c. 1630-1773', in *Russian Society and Culture and the Long Eighteenth Century: Essays in Honour of Anthony G. Cross*, ed. by Roger Bartlett and Lindsey Hughes (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2004), pp. 149-66.
- Dubiago, T. B., *Russkie reguliarnye sady i parki* (Leningrad: Gos. izd. literatury po stroitel'stvu, arkhitekture i stroit. materialam, 1963).
- Egorov, Igor, *The Architectural Planning of St. Petersburg*, trans. by Eric Dluhosch (Athens, GA: Ohio University Press, 1969).
- Elias, Norbert, *The Civilizing Process [Revised Edition]*, ed. and transl. by Edmund Jephcott (London: Blackwell, 2000), 2 vols.
- Engelstein, Laura, 'Combined Underdevelopment: Discipline and the Law in Imperial and Soviet Russia', in *Foucault and the Writing of History*, ed. by Jan Goldstein (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), pp. 220-36.
- Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, ed. by I. E. Andreevskii (St Petersburg: Brockhaus and Efron, 1890-1907), 82 vols.
- Esipov, Grigorii V., *Raskol'nich'i dela XVIII stolietia: izvlechennia iz del Preobrazhenskago Prikaza i tainoi rozysknykh del kantseliarii* (St Petersburg: Izd. D. E. Kozhanchikova, 1861-63), 2 vols.
- Etimologicheskii slovar' russkogo iazyka*, comp. by Max Vasmer, ed. by Boris A. Larin and transl. by Oleg N. Trubachev (Moscow: Progress, 1986), 4 vols.
- Fennell, John L., *A History of the Russian Church to 1448* (London and New York: Longman, 1995).
- Freeze, Gregory, 'The Soslovie (Estate) Paradigm and Russian Social History', *American Historical Review*, vol. 91, no. 1 (1986), pp. 11-36.
- Gerngross (Vsevolodskii), Vsevolod S., *Teatral'nye zdaniia v Sankt-Peterburge v XVIII stoletii* (St Petersburg: Sirius, 1910).
- Gleason, Abbot, 'The Terms of Russian Social History', in *Between Tsar and People: Educated Society and the Quest for Public Identity in Late Imperial Russia*, ed. by Edith W. Clowes, Samuel D. Kossow and James L. West (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991), pp. 15-27.
- Goffman, Erving, *Behaviour in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organisation of*

- Gatherings* (Glencoe, NY: The Free Press, 1963).
- Goffman, Erving, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (London: Allen Lane, 1969).
- Goodman, Dena, 'Public Sphere and Private Life: Towards a Synthesis of Current Historiographical Approaches to the Old Regime', *History and Theory*, vol. 31 (1992), pp. 1-20
- Goodman, Dena, *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment* (Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press, 1994).
- Gordin, Iakov A., 'Delo tsarevicha Alekseia ili tiazhba o tsene reform', *Zvezda*, no. 11 (1991), pp. 120-43.
- Gordin, Michael D., 'The Importance of Being Earnest: The Early St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences', *ISIS*, 91 (2000), pp. 1-31.
- Gozenpud, Abram A., *Muzykal'nyi teatr v Rossii: ot istokov do Glinki. Ocherki* (Leningrad: Muzgiz, 1959).
- Grebeniuk, V. P., 'Publichnye zrelishcha petrovskogo vremeni i ikh sviaz' s teatrom', in *Novye cherty v russkoi literature i iskusstve (XVII - nachala XVIII v.)*, ed. by A. N. Robinson (Moscow: Nauka, 1976), pp. 133-45.
- Griffiths, David M., 'Eighteenth-Century Perceptions of Backwardness: Projects for the Creation of a Third Estate in Catherinean Russia', *Canadian-American Slavic Studies*, vol. 13, no. 4 (1979), pp. 452-72.
- Habermas, Jurgen, *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit: Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft* (Neuwied and Berlin: Luchterhand, 1962).
- translated as: *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, transl. by Thomas Burger (Oxford: Polity Press, 1989).
- Hammarberg, Gitta, 'Reading à la mode: The First Russian Women's Journals', in *Reflections on Russia in the Eighteenth Century*, ed. by Joachim Klein, Simon Dixon and Maarten Frannje (Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 2001), pp. 218-32.
- Hans, Nicholas, 'The Moscow School of Mathematics and Navigation (1701)', *Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 29 (1951), pp. 532-36.

- Hartley, Janet, *A Social History of the Russian Empire, 1650-1825* (London and New York: Longman, 1999).
- Hassell, James, 'Implementation of the Russian Table of Ranks during the Eighteenth Century', *Slavic Review*, vol. 29, no. 2 (1970), pp. 283-99.
- Hittle, J. M., *The Service City: State and Townsmen in Russia, 1600-1800* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979).
- Hudson Jr., Hugh D., 'Urban Estate Engineering in Eighteenth-Century Russia: Catherine the Great and the Elusive Meshchanstvo', *Canadian-American Slavic Studies*, vol. 18 (1984), pp. 393-410.
- Hughes, Lindsey, *Russia and the West: The Life of a Seventeenth-Century Westerniser, Prince Vasily Vasil'evich Golitsyn (1643-1714)* (Cambridge, MA: Oriental Research Partners, 1984).
- Hughes, Lindsey, *Sophia, Regent of Russia, 1657-1704* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990).
- Hughes, Lindsey, 'Between Two Worlds: Tsarevna Natal'ia Alekseevna and the Emancipation of Petrine Women', in *A Window on Russia: Papers from the V International Conference of the Study Group on Eighteenth-Century Russia: Gargnano, 1994*, ed. by Maria di Salvo and Lindsey Hughes (Rome: La Fenice, 1996), pp. 29-36.
- Hughes, Lindsey, 'Peter the Great's Two Weddings: Changing Images of Women in a Transitional Age', in *Women in Russia and Ukraine*, ed. by R. Marsh (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 31-44.
- Hughes, Lindsey, 'The Courts of Moscow and St Petersburg, c. 1547-1725', in *The Princely Courts of Europe, 1500-1750*, ed. by John Adamson (London: Weidenfield and Nicolson, 1999), pp. 295-313.
- Hughes, Lindsey, *Playing Games: The Alternative History of Peter the Great: Inaugural Lecture* (London: SSEES, 2000).
- Hughes, Lindsey, 'The Petrine Year: Anniversaries and Festivals in the Reign of Peter I (1682-1725)', in *Festival Culture in Germany and Europe from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Century*, ed. by Karin Friedrich (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2000), pp. 149-67.

- Hughes, Lindsey, 'From Caftans to Corsets: The Sartorial Transformation of Women in the Reign of Peter the Great', in *Gender and Sexuality in Russian Civilisation*, ed. by Peter Barta (London: Routledge, 2001), pp. 17-32.
- Hughes, Lindsey, *Peter the Great: A Biography* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002).
- Hughes, Lindsey, "'The Crown of Maidenly Honour and Virtue': Redefining Femininity in Peter I's Russia', in *Women and Gender in Eighteenth-Century Russia*, ed. by Wendy Rosslyn (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 35-59.
- Hughes, Lindsey, 'Women and the Arts at the Russian Court from the 16th to the 18th Century', in *An Imperial Collection: Women Artists from the State Hermitage Museum*, ed. by Jordana Pomeroy (Washington DC: National Museum of Women in the Arts, 2003), pp. 19-49.
- Hughes, Lindsey, "'A Beard is an Unnecessary Burden": Peter I's Laws on Shaving and their Roots in Early Russia', in *Russian Society and Culture and the Long Eighteenth Century: Essays in Honour of Anthony G. Cross*, ed. by Roger Bartlett and Lindsey Hughes (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2004), pp. 21-34.
- Hughes, Lindsey, 'The Funerals of the Russian Emperors and Empresses' (forthcoming).
- Hull, Isabel V., *Sexuality, State and Civil Society in Germany, 1700-1815* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996).
- Istoriia Biblioteki Akademii nauk SSSR, 1714-1964*, ed. by Sergei P. Luppov and M. S. Fillipov (Leningrad: Nauka, 1964).
- Jacob, Margaret C., 'The Mental Landscape of the Public Sphere: A European Perspective', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 28, no. 1 (1994), pp. 95-113.
- Jensen, Claudia R., 'Music for the Tsar: A Preliminary Study of the Music of the Muscovite Court Theatre', *Musical Quarterly*, vol. 79, no. 2 (1995), pp. 368-401.
- Jones, Colin, 'The Great Chain of Buying: Medical Advertisement, the Bourgeois Public Sphere and the Origins of the French Revolution', *American Historical Review*, vol. 101, no. 1 (1996), pp. 13-40.
- Jones, Robert E., 'Getting the Goods to St. Petersburg: Water Transport from the Interior, 1703-1811', *Slavic Review*, vol. 43 (1984), pp. 413-433.

- Jones, Robert E., 'Why St Petersburg?', in *Peter the Great and the West: New Perspectives*, ed. by Lindsey Hughes (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 189-205.
- Kagan, Moisei, *Grad Petrov v istorii russkoi kul'tury* (St Petersburg: Slaviia, 1996).
- Kaganov, Grigorii, *Sankt-Peterburg: Obrazy prostranstva* (Moscow: Izd. Indrik, 1995).
- translated as: *Images of Space: St. Petersburg in the Visual and Verbal Arts*, transl. by Sidney Monas (Stanford, CA, 1997)
- Kaganov, Grigorii, "As in the Ship of Peter", *Slavic Review*, vol. 50, no. 4 (1991), pp. 755-67.
- Kahan, Arcadius, 'The Costs of "Westernisation" in Russia: The Gentry and the Economy in the Eighteenth Century', *Slavic Review*, vol. 25 (1966), pp. 40-66.
- Kamenskii, Aleksandr B., *The Russian Empire in the Eighteenth Century: Searching for a Place in the World*, transl. by David M. Griffiths (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1997).
- Kamenskii, Aleksandr M., 'Russian and Western Eighteenth-Century Towns: Possible Aspects of Comparison', in *Russian Society and Culture and the Long Eighteenth Century: Essays in Honour of Anthony G. Cross*, ed. by Roger P. Bartlett and Lindsey Hughes (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2004), pp. 62-71.
- Karlinsky, Simon, *Russian Drama from its Beginnings to the Age of Pushkin* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1985).
- Kavanagh, Thomas M., *Enlightenment and the Shadows of Chance: The Novel and the Culture of Gambling in Eighteenth-Century France* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993).
- Kazakevich, Natal'ia, *Tsarskie zastol'ia v XVIII veke: tseremonial i dekorativnoe oformlenie paradnykh stolov pri dvore imperatrits Elizavety i Ekateriny II* (St Petersburg: Zolotaia kniga, 2003).
- Keller, Elena E., *Prazdnichnaia kul'tura Petersburga: ocherki istorii* (St Petersburg: Izd. V. A. Mikhailova, 2001).
- Kelly, Catriona, *Petrushka: The Russian Carnival Puppet Theatre* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).
- Kelly, Catriona, 'The Origins of Russian Theatre', in *A History of Russian Theatre*, ed.

- by Robert Leach and Victor Borovsky (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 18-40.
- Kelly, Catriona, *Refining Russia: Advice Literature, Polite Culture, and Gender from Catherine to Yeltsin* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
- Kholodov, Efim G., *Teatr i zriteli: stranitsy istorii russkoi teatral'noi publiki* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennyi institut iskusstvoznaniia, 2000).
- Khoteev, Pavel I., 'Frantsuzskaia kniga v biblioteke Peterburgskoi Akademii nauk (1714-1742 gg.)', in *Frantsuzskaia kniga v Rossii v XVIII v. Ocherki istorii*, ed. by Sergei P. Luppov (Leningrad: Nauka, 1986), pp. 5-58.
- Kirsanova, Raisa M., *Russkii kostium i byt XVIII - XIX vekov* (Moscow: Slovo, 2002).
- Kizevetter, Aleksandr A., *Posadskie obshchina v Rossii XVIII stoletii* (Moscow: Universitetskaia Tip., 1903).
- Klein, Lawrence, 'Gender and the Public/Private Distinction in the Eighteenth Century: Some Questions about Evidence and Analytic Procedure', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 29, no. 1 (1995), pp. 97-109.
- Kliuchevskii, Vasilii O., *Peter the Great*, transl. by Liliana Archibald (London: MacMillan Press, 1968).
- Kollmann, Nancy S., 'The Seclusion of Elite Muscovite Women,' *Russian History*, vol. 10 (1983), pp. 170-187.
- Konechnyi, Albin M., 'Peterburgskie narodnye gulian'ia na maslenoi i paskhal'noi nedeliakh', in *Peterburg i guberniia: istoriko-etnograficheskie issledovaniia*, ed. by Natal'ia V. Iukhneva (Leningrad: Nauka, 1989), pp. 5-20.
- Kopanev, Nikolai A., 'Frantsuzskie knigi v Letnem dome imperatritsy Elizavety Petrovny', in *Kniga i biblioteki v Rossii v XIV - pervoi polovine XIX veka*, ed. by A. A. Zaitseva and Sergei P. Luppov (Leningrad: Biblioteka Akademii Nauk, 1982), pp. 26-41.
- Koselleck, Reinhart, *Kritik und krise: ein beitrag zur pathogenese der bürgerlichen welt* (Freiburg: K. Alber, 1959).
- translated as: *Critique and Crisis: Enlightenment and the Pathogenesis of Modern Society* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1988).
- Kosheleva, Ol'ga E., "Svoe detstvo" v drevnei rusi i v Rossii epokhi prosveshcheniia

(XVI- XVIII vv.) (Moscow: URAO, 2000).

Kossow, Samuel D., James L. West and Edith W. Clowes, 'Introduction: The Problem of the Middle in Late Imperial Russian Society', in *Between Tsar and People: Educated Society and the Quest for Public Identity in Late Imperial Russia*, ed. by Edith W. Clowes, Samuel D. Kossow and James L. West (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991), pp. 3-14.

Kostium v russkoi khudozhestvennoi kul'ture 18 - pervoi poloviny 20 vv. Opyt entsiklopedii, ed. and comp. by Raisa M. Kirsanova, T. G Morozova and V. D Siniukov (Moscow: Bol'shaia rossiiskaia entsiklopediia, 1995).

Landes, Joan, *Women and the Public Sphere in the Age of the Enlightenment* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994).

LaVopa, Anthony V., 'Conceiving a Public: Ideas and Society in Eighteenth-Century Europe', *Journal of Modern History*, vol. 64 (1992), pp. 79-116.

LeDonne, John P., *Absolutism and Ruling Class: The Formation of the Russian Political Order, 1700-1825* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).

Levin, Eve, *Sex and Society in the World of the Orthodox Slavs, 900-1700* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989).

Likhachev, Dmitrii S., *Poeziia sadov: k semantike sadovo-parkovykh stilei. Sad kak tekst* (St Petersburg: Nauka, 1991).

Lindenmeyr, Adele, 'Public Life, Private Virtues: Women in Russian Charity, 1762-1914', *Signs: Journal of Women and Culture*, vol. 18, no. 31 (1993), pp. 562-91.

Linder, Isaak M., *Shakhmaty na Rusi*, 2nd Edition (Moscow: Nauka, 1975).

Liubimenko, I. I. and R. M. Tonkova, 'Kul'turnaia zhizn' Peterburga', in *Peterburg Petrovskogo vremeni: ocherki*, ed. by Anatolii V. Predtechenskii (Leningrad: Lenizdat, 1948), pp. 93-124.

Lotman, Iurii M. and Boris A. Uspenskii, 'Echoes of the Notion "Moscow the Third Rome" in Peter the Great's Ideology', in *The Semiotics of Russian Culture*, ed. and transl. by Ann Shukman (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1984), pp. 53-67.

Lotman, Iurii M., 'The Poetics of Everyday Behavior in Russian Eighteenth-Century

- Culture', in Iurii M. Lotman and Boris A. Uspenskii, *The Semiotics of Russian Culture*, ed. and transl. by Ann Shukman (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1984), pp. 231-56.
- Lotman, Iurii M., *Besedy o russkoi kul'ture: Byt i traditsii russkogo dvorianstva (XVIII - nachalo XIX veka)* (St Petersburg: Iskusstvo, 2002).
- Lukowski, Jerzy, *The European Nobility in the Eighteenth Century* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2003).
- Luppov, Sergei P., *Istoriia stroitel'stva Peterburga* (Moscow: Nauka, 1957).
- Luppov, Sergei P. *Kniga v Rossii v pervoi chetverti XVIII veka* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1973).
- Luppov, Sergei P., *Kniga v Rossii v poslepetrovskoe vremia: 1725-1740* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1976).
- Maggs, Barbara W., "Firework Art and Literature: Eighteenth-Century Pyrotechnical Tradition in Russia and Western Europe", *Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 54 (1976), pp. 24-40.
- Mah, Harold, 'Phantasies of the Public Sphere: Rethinking the Habermas of Historians', *Journal of Modern History*, vol. 72 (2000), pp. 153-82.
- Marker, Gary, *Publishing, Printing, and the Origins of Intellectual Life in Russia, 1700-1800* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985).
- Marker, Gary, 'Russian Journals and their Readers in the Late Eighteenth Century', *Oxford Slavonic Papers [NS]*, vol. 19 (1986), pp. 88-101.
- Maza, Sarah, 'Women, the Bourgeoisie, and the Public Sphere: Response to Daniel Gordon and David Bell', *French Historical Studies*, vol. 17, no. 4 (1992), pp. 935-50.
- Mazaev, Anatolii I., *Prazdnik kak sotsial'no-khudozhestvennoe iavlenie: opyt istoriko-teoreticheskogo issledovaniia* (Moscow: Nauka, 1978).
- McNeill, William H., *Keeping Together in Time: Dance and Drill in Human History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995).
- Meehan-Waters, Brenda, *Autocracy and Aristocracy: The Russian Service Elite of 1730* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1982).
- Melton, James van Horn, *The Rise of the Public in Enlightenment Europe* (Cambridge:

- Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- Miers, David, *Regulating Commercial Gambling: Past, Present, and Future* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).
- Mikhnevich, Vladimir O., 'Istoriia kartochnoi igry na Rusi', *Istoricheskii vestnik*, no. 2 (1901), pp. 583-86.
- Mironov, Boris, 'Social Policies of Catherine II and their Results: Establishment of Estate Paradigm in Law and Social Consciousness', in *Rußland zur zeit Katharinas II: Absolutismus - Aufklärung - Pragmatismus*, ed. by Eckhard Hübner, Jan Kusber and Peter Nitsche (Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 1998), pp. 115-35.
- Monas, Sidney, 'Anton Divier and the Police of St Petersburg', in *For Roman Jakobson: Essays on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. by Morris Halle (The Hague: Mouton, 1956), pp. 361-66.
- Munro, George E., 'Shafirov, Petr Pavlovich', in *Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*, ed. by Joseph L. Wieczynski (Gulf Breeze, FL: Academic International Press, 1990), vol. 34, pp. 122-26.
- Muzykal'nyi Peterburg. Entsiklopedicheskii slovar': XVIII vek*, ed. by Anna L. Porfir'eva (St Petersburg: Kompozitor, 1999-2000), 3 vols.
- Neverov, Oleg, "'His Majesty's Cabinet" and Peter I's Kunstkammer', in *The Origins of Museums: The Cabinet of Curiosities in Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century Europe*, ed. by Oliver Impey and Arthur McGregor (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), pp. 54-61.
- Ocherki istorii Leningrada. Tom 1: Period feodalizma, 1703-1861*, ed. by M. P. Viatkin (Moscow: Akademiia Nauk SSSR, 1955).
- Okenfuss, Max J., 'Russian Students in Europe in the Age of Peter the Great', in John G. Garrard (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), pp. 131-145.
- Okenfuss, Max J., 'Technical Training in Russia under Peter the Great', *History of Education Quarterly*, vol. 13 (1973), pp. 325-345.
- Okenfuss, Max J., *The Discovery of Childhood in Russia: The Evidence of the Slavic Primer* (Newtonville, MA: Oriental Research Partners, 1980).
- Oz-Salzberger, Fania, *Translating the Enlightenment: Scottish Civic Discourse in Eighteenth-Century Germany* (Oxford and New York: Clarendon Press, 1995).

- Parchevskii, Georgii F., *Karty i kartezhniki* (St Petersburg: Izd. Pushkinskogo fonda, 1998).
- Parlett, David S., *A History of Card Games* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).
- Pavlenko, Nikolai I., *Strasti u trona: istoriia dvortsovykh perevorotov* (Moscow: 'Rodina', 1996).
- Pekarskii, Petr P., *Istoriia Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk v Peterburge* (St Petersburg: Tip. Imp. Akademii Nauk, 1870-73), 2 vols.
- Perlinska, Agnieszka, 'A Semiotic Analysis of Eighteenth-Century Russian Culture: Discovering the Past and Modelling the Present', *Historical Reflections/ Réflexions Historiques*, vol. 18, no. 2 (1992), pp. 45-57.
- Petrov, Petr N., *Istoriia Sankt-Peterburga s osnovaniia goroda do vvedeniia v deistvie vybornogo gorodskogo upravleniia po uchrezhdeniiam o guberniiakh: 1703-1782* (Moscow: Tsentrpoligraf, 2004).
- Pisarenko, Konstantin A., *Povsednevnaia zhizn' russkogo dvora v tsarstvovanie Elizavety Petrovny* (Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 2003).
- Poe, Marshall, *A People Born to Slavery: Russia in Early Modern European Ethnography, 1476-1748* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000).
- Pogosian, Elena, *Petr I - arkhitektorskaia istoriia* (St Petersburg: Iskusstvo-SPB, 2001).
- Pososhkov, Ivan T., *The Book of Poverty and Wealth*, ed. and transl. by A. P. Vlasto and L. R. Lewitter (London: Athlone Press, 1987).
- Predtechenskii, Anatolii V., 'Naselenie i byt Peterburga', in *Peterburg Petrovskogo vremeni: ocherki*, ed. by Anatolii V. Predtechenskii (Leningrad: Lenizdat, 1948), pp. 125-56.
- Prussak, A., 'Inzhenernye shkoly pri Petre I', *Voenno-istoricheskii zhurnal*, no. 7 (1940).
- Pyliaev, Mikhail I., *Staroe zhit'e: ocherki i razskazy* (Moscow: Kniga, 1990).
- Pyliaev, Mikhail I., *Staryi Peterburg: razskazy iz byloi zhizni stolitsy* (St Petersburg: IKPA, 1889).
- Raeff, Marc, *Origins of the Russian Intelligentsia: The Eighteenth-Century Nobility* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966).

- Raeff, Marc, 'The Well-Ordered Police State and the Development of Modernity in Seventeenth and Eighteenth-Century Europe: An Attempt at a Comparative Approach', *American Historical Review*, vol. 80 (1975), pp. 1221-43.
- Raeff, Marc, *The Well-Ordered Police State: Social and Institutional Change through Law in the Germanies and Russia, 1600-1800* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983).
- Raeff, Marc, 'Transfiguration and Modernisation: The Paradoxes of Social Disciplining, Paedagogical Leadership, and the Enlightenment in 18th-Century Russia', in *Political Ideas and Institutions in Imperial Russia*, ed. by Marc Raeff (Oxford: Westview Press, 1994), pp. 334-47.
- Ransel, David L., 'Character and Style of Patron-Client Relations in Russia', in *Klientelsysteme im Europa der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. by Antoni Maczak (Oldenbourg: Munich, 1988), pp. 211-231.
- Reith, Gerda, *The Age of Chance: Gambling in Western World* (London: Routledge, 1999).
- Roche, Daniel, *The Culture of Clothing: Dress and Fashion in the Ancien Régime*, transl. by Jean Birrell (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- Rosslyn, Wendy, 'In and Between the Public and Private Spheres: Women and their Writing in Eighteenth- and early Nineteenth-Century Russia' (unpublished paper).
- Rosslyn, Wendy, *Feats of Agreeable Usefulness: Translations by Russian Women, 1763-1825* (Fichtenwalde: Verlag F. K. Göpfert, 2000).
- Rosslyn, Wendy, 'Making their Way into Print: Poems by Eighteenth-Century Russian Women', *Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 78, no. 3 (2000), pp. 407-38.
- Rosslyn, Wendy, 'Mar'ya Vasil'evna Sushkova: An Enlightened Woman of the Eighteenth Century', *Oxford Slavonic Papers [New Series]*, vol. 33 (2000), pp. 85-107.
- Ryan, W. F., 'Navigation and the Modernisation of Petrine Russia: Teachers, Textbooks, Terminology', in *Russia in the Age of the Enlightenment: Essays for Isabel de Madariaga*, ed. by Roger P. Bartlett and Janet M. Hartley (New York and London: St Martin's Press, 1990), pp. 75-105.

- Schierle, Ingrid, 'Zur politisch-sozialen Begriffssprache der Regierung Katharinas II. Gesellschaft und Gesellschaften: "obshchestvo"', in *Katharina II. Rußland und Europa: Beiträge zur internationalen Forschung*, ed. by Claus Scharf (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2001), pp. 275-306.
- Schulze, Liudmila, 'The Russification of the St Petersburg Academy of Sciences and Arts in the Eighteenth Century', *British Journal for the History of Science*, vol. 18 (1985), pp.
- Schuyler, Eugene, *Peter the Great, Emperor of Russia: A Study of Historical Biography* (New York: Russell and Russell, 1967), 2 vols.
- Seaman, Gerald R., *History of Russian Music, Volume 1: From its Origins to Dargomyzhsky* (Oxford and New York: Blackwell, 1967).
- Semenova, Lidiia N., *Ocherki istorii byta i kul'turnoi zhizni Rossii pervaiia polovina XVIII v.* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1982).
- Semenova, Lidiia N., 'Obshchestvennye razvlecheniia v Peterburge v pervoi polovine XVIII v.', in *Staryi Peterburg: istoriko-etnograficheskie issledovaniia*, ed. by Natal'ia V. Iukhneva (Leningrad: Nauka, 1982), pp. 147-63.
- Semenova, Lidiia N., *Byt i naselenie Sankt-Peterburga (XVIII vek)* (St Petersburg: BLITs, 1998).
- Semevskii, Mikhail I., *Tsaritsa Katerina Alekseevna, Anna i Villem Mons, 1692-1724: ocherki iz russkoi istorii XVIII veka* (St Petersburg: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1990).
- Semevskii, Mikhail I., *Tsaritsa Praskov'ia, 1664-1723: ocherki i razskazy iz russkoi istorii XVIII veka* (Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1991).
- Sennett, Richard, *The Fall of Public Man* (London: Faber and Faber, 1986).
- Shaw, Denis, 'St Petersburg and Geographies of Modernity in Eighteenth-Century Russia', in *St Petersburg, 1703-1825*, ed. by Anthony Cross (Palgrave: Basingstoke, 2003), pp. 6-29.
- Shepelev, Leonid E., *Chinovnyi mir Rossii: XVIII - nachalo XX v.* (St Petersburg: Iskusstvo-SPB, 1999).
- Shliapkin, Il'ia S., *Tsarevna Natal'ia Alekseevna i teatr ee vremeni* (St Petersburg: V. Balashev, 1898).

- Shubinskii, Sergei N., *Istoricheskie ocherki i rasskazy* (Moscow: Moskovskii rabochii, 1995).
- Siiatel'nye zheny: Biografii i rodoslovnaia stats-damy i freilin russkogo Dvora, po spiskam P. F. Karabanova*, ed. and comp. by V. P. Parkhomenko (St Petersburg: A. S. Suvorin, 1992).
- Slovar' Akademii Rossiiskoi, 1789-94*, ed. by G. A. Bogatova et al. (Moscow: MGI im. E. R. Dashkovoi, 2001-5), 6 vols.
- Slovar' russkogo iazyka XVIII veka*, ed. by Stepan G. Barkhudarov et al. (St Petersburg: Nauka, 1984-), 14 vols. to date.
- Smirnov, Nikolai A., *Zapadnoe vliianie na russkii iazyk v petrovskuiu epokhu* (St Petersburg: Tip. Imp. Akademii nauk, 1910).
- Smirnov, Sergei B., *Peterburg-Moskva: summa istorii* (St Petersburg: Izd. RGPU im. A. I. Getsena, 2000).
- Smith, R. E. F. and David Christian, *Bread and Salt: A Social and Economic History of Food and Drink in Russia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).
- Smith, Douglas C., *Working the Rough Stone: Freemasonry and Society in Eighteenth-Century Russia* (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1999).
- Stolpianskii, Petr N., *Muzyka i muzitsirovanie v starom Peterburge* (Leningrad: Muzyka, 1989).
- Stolpianskii, Petr N., *Peterburg: kak vznik, osnovalsia i ros Sankt-Piterburkh* (St Petersburg: Nauchno-izdatel'skii tsentr NeGA, 1995).
- Tarabukin, Nikolai M., *Ocherki po istorii kostiuma* (Moscow: GITIS, 1994).
- Thyret, Isolde, *Between God and Tsar: Religious Symbolism and the Royal Women of Muscovite Russia* (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2001).
- Tiulichev, Dmitrii V., 'Sotsial'nyi sostav podpischikov "Sanktpeterburgskikh vedomostei" (seredina XVIII v.)', in *Kniga v Rossii. XVI - seredina XIX veka: knigarasprostranenie, biblioteka, chitatel'* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1987), pp. 62-70.
- Toporov, Vladimir N., *Peterburgskii tekst russkoi literatury: izbrannye trudy* (St Petersburg: Iskusstvo-SPB, 2003).
- Treadgold, Warren T., *A History of the Byzantine State and Society* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997).

- Vasil'ev, Vladimir N., *Starinnye feierverki v Rossii, XVII - pervaiia chetvert' XVIII veka* (Leningrad: Izd. Gos. Ermitazha, 1960).
- Veselago, Feodosii F., *Ocherk istorii morskago kadetskago korpusa* (St Petersburg: Tip. Morskago Kadetskago Korpusa, 1852).
- Volkov, Nikolai E., *Dvor russkikh imperatorov v ego proshlom i nastoiashchem, v 4-kh chastiakh* (St Petersburg: Pech. R. Golike, 1900).
- Volkov, Vadim, 'The Forms of Public Life: The Public Sphere and the Concept of Society in Imperial Russia', unpublished Ph.D. thesis (Wolfson College: University of Cambridge, 1995).
- Vowles, Judith, 'The "Feminisation" of Russian Literature: Women, Language and Literature in Eighteenth-Century Russia', in *Women Writers in Russian Literature*, ed. by Toby W. Clyman and Diana Greene (Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1994), pp. 35-60.
- Vsevolodskii-Gerngross, Vsevolod N., *Istoriia teatral'nago obrazovaniia v Rossii. Tom I (XVII i XVIII vv.)* (St Petersburg: Izd. Direksii Imp. Teatrov, 1913).
- Vsevolodskii-Gerngross, Vsevolod N., *Istoriia russkogo teatra v dvukh tomakh* (Moscow and Leningrad: Tea-Kino Pechat', 1929), 2 vols.
- Vysotskii, Ivan P., *Sankt-Peterburgskaia stolichnaia politsiia i gradonachalstvo, 1703-1903* (St Petersburg: Pech. R. Golike & A Vil'borg, 1903).
- Werrett, Simon, 'An Odd Sort of Display: The St Petersburg Academy of Sciences in Enlightened Russia', unpublished Ph.D. thesis (University of Cambridge: King's College, 2000).
- Wirtschafter, Elise Kimlering, 'In Search of the People, In Search of Russia', *Russian Review*, vol. 60 (2001), pp. 497-504.
- Wirtschafter, Elise Kimerling, 'The Search for Society in Eighteenth-Century Russia', *Study Group on Eighteenth-Century Russia Newsletter*, no. 30 (2002), pp. 24-33.
- Wirtschafter, Elise Kimerling, *The Play of Ideas in Russian Enlightenment Theatre* (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2003).
- Wortman, Richard S., *Scenarios of Power: Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy, Volume One: From Peter the Great to the Death of Nicholas I* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995).

- Zakharine, Dmitri, 'Tanz- und Körperverhalten im kommunikativen Alltagsverkehr des 17.-19. Jh. Russland und Westeuropa im Vergleich', *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, vol. 47 (2001), pp. 139-205.
- Zakharova, Ol'ga Iu., *Svetskie tseremonialy v Rossii XVIII-nachala XX v.* (Moscow: Tsentrpoligraf, 2001).
- Zelov, Dmitrii D., *Ofitsial'nye svetskie prazdniki kak iavlenie russkoi kul'tury kontsa XVII - pervoi poloviny XVIII veka* (Moscow: URSS, 2002).
- Zguta, Russell, *Russian Minstrels: A History of the Skomorokhi* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1978).
- Zitser, Ernest A., *The Transfigured Kingdom: Sacred Parody and Charismatic Authority at the Court of Peter the Great* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004).
- Zotov, Vladimir P., 'Istoriia kartochnoi igry', *Nov'*, nos. 12 & 13 (1886).

Appendix One - Key to Maps

NB. the key applies to both the 1725 map and the 1753 map. Buildings with different functions in the later period are marked accordingly.

1. Sts Peter & Paul fortress & cathedral.
2. Admiralty yard & fortress.
3. Cathedral of the Holy Trinity & Trinity Square.
4. Petrine Winter Palace.
5. St Aleksandr Nevskii monastery & seminary.
6. Tsaritsyn Meadow.
7. Petrine Summer Palace, 'First' Summer Gardens & grotto.
8. 'Second' Summer Gardens.
9. 'Third' Summer Gardens & Elizabeth's Summer Palace
10. Triumphal Arch.
11. Menshikov Palace; [1753 map] Cadet Corps.
12. Palace of Praskov'ia Fedorovna; [1753 map] Academy of Sciences, library & *Kunstkamera*.
13. Palace of Natal'ia Alekseevna & her theatre.
14. 'Four Frigates' pyramid and coffee house.
15. Nevskii Prospekt.
16. [1753 map] Winter Palace.
17. Moika river.
18. Imperial Opera House.
19. Pontoon bridge.
20. [1753 map] Gardens of the Cadet Corps.
21. Fireworks theatre (built on the water).
22. Millionnaia ulitsa.
23. Original Imperial Opera House (destroyed 1749)
24. Church of the Holy Mother of Kazan'.
25. Gostinyi dvor.
26. Anichkov bridge & Anichkov Palace.



